DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 739 JC 850 525

TITLE	1985 Basic Agenda.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Board of Governors.
PUB DATE	25 Jan 85
NOTE	102p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Role; *Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Quality; *Financial Support; *Governance; *Governing Boards; Needs Assessment; Organizational Objectives; Policy Formation; State Agencies; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

This report identifies the major issues facing community colleges in California and presents the judgements of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges concerning how these issues should be addressed, placing particular emphasis on what should be done during 1985. The issues constituting the basic agenda of the Board for 1985 are presented: (1) secure adequate, stable, predictable and equitable funding for community colleges; (2) promote excellence in community college programs by strengthening transfer and vocational education functions; securing passage of matriculation reform; developing new policies related to course offerings, the associate degree, and student services; and by developing community college employees; (3) continue to review the mission of community colleges and develop recommended policy on the establishment of priorities; (4) clarify and improve the governance structure for community colleges; and (5) continue to improve the effectiveness of state agency operations. The basic agenda is followed by a background document which separately analyzes issues in the areas of educational programs, student access and services, finance, governance, and employees. The second section of this document presents major conclusions and policymaking responses with respect to improving the policymaking process and setting the 1985 basic agenda. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261739

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Hayward
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

1985 BASIC AGENDA

JC 850 525

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
1107 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 445-8752

California's community colleges are in transition. While change has been rapid and constant since Proposition 13, the next three years promise to be a watershed period. Community colleges will undergo a review of their mission, be financed by a new long-term mechanism, be guided by a new statewide Chancellor, and will continue a series of reform and renewal efforts which will have profound effects on the colleges themselves and the students who attend them in the future.

The Board of Governors has recognized the compelling need to address and interrelate the many issues and changes that must be dealt with during this period. Not all issues confronting community colleges, or that community colleges need to confront, can be addressed simultaneously. Instead, a logical sequence for addressing the major issues must be decided upon and carried out over the next few years.

Through its "Basic Agenda" the Board offers its best judgment about how the major community college issues should be addressed, with particular focus on what should be done during 1985. The Board has reached this judgment through an extensive analysis of the issues themselves, and through consultation with concerned state and local policymakers and educators.

The text of the 1985 Basic Agenda, which commences on the following page, is supported by a background document which separately analyzes issues in the five areas of educational programs, students, finance, governance and employees. The background document closes by identifying the major conclusions and policymaking responses which emerge from this comprehensive analysis.

The Board of Governors invites active review of its 1985 Basic Agenda. We hope in this document we have the beginnings of a healthy process for policymaking. Our goal is relatively simple. California has the finest system of community colleges in the world. With focused efforts at renewal, conducted through a deliberate process, we intend to keep it that way.

George David Kieffer
President, Board of Governors

January 25, 1985

BOARD OF GOVERNORS' BASIC AGENDA FOR 1985

1. *Secure adequate, stable, predictable and equitable funding for community colleges.*

   - Adequate funding for 1985-86 and 1986-87 should include full funding for the SB 851 mechanism, as well as resources to rebuild the community college infrastructure and support services -- particularly in the areas of deferred maintenance, equipment renewal and replacement, matriculation, and program review and planning. Rebuilding these areas should not be accomplished through new permanent categorical programs, but rather by programs which meet the transitional needs to differential funding or other long-term funding. In addition, 1985-86 funding may require some adjustment to the ADA loss mechanism.

   - Enactment of the new long-term community college funding mechanism to replace SB 851 should occur by the end of the 1986 session (September 1986), to take effect on July 1, 1987 (the sunset date of SB 851). This new mechanism should be developed during 1985 and 1986, and should give full consideration to the principles of differential funding. Differential funding, if adopted, must be phased in, and the Board of Governors should be provided with authority to determine and adjust appropriate workload measures, as well as to certify the overall level of funding. To provide additional stability regarding long-term finance, the new mechanism should, if possible, address any relevant recommendations from the mission review; and should also address the issue of the extension of student fees, which are due to sunset on January 1, 1988.

2. *Promote excellence in community college programs, services, and employees by continuing state-level efforts to strengthen the quality and vitality of the transfer and vocational education functions; by securing passage and funding of the matriculation reform; by developing new policy to ensure the rigor of course offerings, policy to strengthen the purposes and meaning of the associate degree, and policy to define and revitalize student services; by developing new policy and securing necessary resources to provide for the development and renewal of community college employees; and by encouraging and acknowledging local and other efforts to achieve excellence.*

   - For excellence in programs, the Board will continue to strengthen the quality and vitality of the transfer function by coordinating with UC, CSU, and CPEC on an overall plan of action that includes new funding for transfer centers and removing barriers to transfer that result from the lack of intersegmental cooperation in articulating courses and course standards. The Board will also continue to strengthen the quality and vitality of vocational education by carrying out specific strategies for its comprehensive vocational education policy, which include ensuring the currency of staff, improving linkages with business and industry, updating instructional equipment, and improving the quality of data on student outcomes and employer satisfaction with vocational education. Recommended policy to ensure the rigor of course offerings, as well as policy reforms to strengthen the meaning and integrity of the associate degree will also be developed during the year.

320/4

- For excellence in services, the Board will work to secure passage and funding of the matriculation model. The Board will also develop recommendations for defining and revitalizing student services.

- For excellence in employees, the Board will continue its inquiry into employment issues, in order to develop short and long-term policies, and will seek funding to ensure continued and frequent opportunities for faculty and staff renewal and development.

- With respect to local and other efforts to promote excellence, the Board will acknowledge and encourage the many programs and activities that districts and other entities are undertaking individually.

3. *Continue to review the mission of community colleges and develop recommended policy on the establishment of priorities.*

   - The Board of Governors will continue to review and establish priorities within the mission of the community colleges, and will complete at least four major activities for referral to the Commission for Review of the Master Plan: 1) Work on future study (trends, implications, and recommended actions) will help policymakers and educators address the ever-changing emphases in programs and services that colleges must be prepared to meet; 2) work on the purposes and structure of remediation in the community colleges will clarify how remediation fits into the mission; 3) work on the various methods of setting mission priorities, including the impact that would occur if priorities were established, will demonstrate the need for the Board of Governors and local districts to retain flexibility in setting priorities; and 4) policies to ensure access will be developed so that full opportunities for postsecondary education are maintained during these times of uncertainty and change.

4. *Clarify and improve the governance structure for community colleges.*

   - The joint governance project initiated in 1984 with district trustees is a critical effort to delineate lines of responsibility between the Board of Governors and local boards, and to promote greater sensitivity in respecting those lines. The work of the specially created Commission on Local and State Board Relationships will be completed during 1985, with necessary accompanying statutory and regulatory changes to follow.

   - The Board will also call upon policymakers and interested participants alike to express commitment to the goal of developing a stable, positive, accountable educational environment which fosters the delivery of excellent education; and in pursuit of this goal to also express a commitment to develop a manageable and sequenced set of policymaking activities to be completed or initiated in 1985.

5. *Continue to improve the effectiveness of state agency operations.*

- o A management study of the Chancellor's Office by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. will be completed by spring of 1985, with appropriate recommendations to be implemented as soon as feasible.

- o Through its proposals for the 1985-86 Budget the Board will continue to press for adequate resources to meet its assigned and emerging responsibilities.

- o A new Community College Relations Committee of the Board will be formed so that additional attention and focus can be given to strengthening relationships and communicating with districts, other educational providers and the general public.

- o Additional internal reforms to improve accountability and leadership will be pursued during 1985, including the development of a proposal to coordinate and consolidate compliance mechanisms, and a proposal for a comprehensive and integrated data system.

BACKGROUND:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS'
BASIC AGENDA FOR 1985

PREFACE

California's community colleges will mark the decade of 1978-1988 as watershed years in their evolution. While the first five years following Proposition 13 (1978) were characterized by rapid change in policies and laws affecting community colleges, the multidirectional and piecemeal approach to policymaking produced few long-term resolutions of critical issues. By 1983 and 1984, however, educational leaders and policymakers began to realize the need to address the growing uncertainty and instability that rapid and sometimes conflicting state-level policymaking was bringing about. During these two years, the State set into motion several critical policies and studies that will resolve major issues and have profound effects on the community colleges and the students who attend them in the future:

- SB 1570, SB 2064 and ACR 162 (1984) provide for a review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, with primary focus on the mission of community colleges. Initial recommendations are due by December 31, 1985, with final recommendations by March 1, 1987;

- SB 851 (1983) establishes the funding mechanism for community colleges until July 1, 1987, and requires the Chancellor to develop plans to implement "matriculation" and "differential funding" in the community colleges. Both of these plans have been developed and await action;

- AB 1XX (1984) repeals various permissive fees and institutes the first-ever tuition charge for community colleges. The measure, which sunsets on January 1, 1988, also provides financial aid and requires a study of the impact of the new fee to be completed by July 1, 1987.

During 1985, 1986 and 1987, which are likely to be the most critical of the watershed years, the current finance mechanism will sunset; a review of the community college mission and the Master Plan for Higher Education will take place, with mission priorities being established; and a new finance mechanism, with or without differential funding concepts, and with or without a new fee structure, will be enacted. In addition, it is likely that some form of the matriculation proposal will be enacted and implemented.

Major changes will also be occurring within the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office. A management study of the Office will have been conducted, and a new Chancellor will have been appointed -- both of which will have significant effects on how the agency performs its various functions. In addition, by late 1986 or early 1987 the Board will be composed substantially of new members.

As educational leaders and State policymakers approach 1985, one of the compelling objectives must be to manage and interrelate not only these major policies which will be developed, but also changes which will be occurring. The magnitude of the decisions to be made will require focused, thoughtful, and bipartisan effort. Not all problems confront-

ing community colleges, or that community colleges need to confront, can be addressed simultaneously. Instead, a logical sequence for making the major decisions needs to be decided upon and adhered to. To do otherwise, to attempt to make these major decisions using the same disjointed approach that has characterized policymaking since Proposition 13, will jeopardize not only the quality of the decisions, but also the delivery of high-quality education by community colleges.

The Basic Agenda is intended to provide educational leaders and State policymakers with the Board's best judgment about the critical community college issues in need of attention during a given year. It is, in essence, the Board's roadmap for policy development -- a document that identifies legislation that needs to be enacted, regulations or guidelines that need to be developed, studies that need to be undertaken, and developmental and leadership activities that need to be pursued.

The Basic Agenda has been developed through an intensive five-month problem-solving approach. This background document reflects extensive input -- from community college officials and organizations, from legislative and executive branch staff and members, and from interested State agencies -- on what they perceive to be the most pressing problems facing community colleges. The document briefly examines these concerns and then summarizes what has been done or is being done to address them. The identified concerns are discussed under five major headings:

A. Educational Programs
B. Students: Access and Services
C. Finance
D. Governance
E. Employees

After summarizing what has been done and is being done regarding the major perceived problems, the analysis proceeds to identify major conclusions and policymaking responses that should occur during 1985. These recommendations were prepared with the following considerations in mind:

- What problems emerge from the detailed analysis as most pressing?

- How can such problems be integrated and focused on within a manageable set of priorities?

- Which problems or policies should be dealt with in 1985, and which in a subsequent year?

Overall, then, the purposes of this background document are to provide the underlying rationale for the Board's 1985 Basic Agenda, and to promote more enlightened policymaking by providing educational leaders and policymakers with a comprehensive summary of the potential issues for attention.

		Page
I.	PART ONE: PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS	1
A.	EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS	1
1.	Background and Concerns (Concerns identified for discussion include: Clarification of the Mission, Academic Quality of Offerings, Remediation, The Transfer Function, The Vocational Education Function, Program Mix, Duplication of Offerings, Program Review and Planning, The Meaning of the Associate Degree, and Articulation)	1
2.	Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns	3
3.	Conclusions	15
B.	STUDENTS: ACCESS AND SERVICES	17
1.	Background and Concerns (Concerns identified for discussion include: Lack of Data, Casual and Recreational Students, Capacity to Profit from Instruction, Adequacy of Student Services, and Student Financial Aid)	17
2.	Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns	21
3.	Conclusions	27
C.	FINANCE	29
1.	Background and Concerns (Concerns identified for discussion include: Funding Levels, Stability and Predictability of Funding, Equity, Appropriateness of ADA, and Fee Policy)	29
2.	Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns	31
3.	Conclusions	38

		Page
D.	GOVERNANCE	40
1.	Background and Concerns (Concerns identified for discussion include: The Legislative Arena, The Arena of the Board of Governors, and The Local Arena)	40
2.	Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns	45
3.	Conclusions	52
E.	EMPLOYEES	55
1.	Background and Concerns (Concerns identified for discussion include: Attrition in Full-Time Instructors, Part-Time Instructors, Tenure, Affirmative Action, Salaries, and Aging Workforce and Morale)	55
2.	Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns	57
3.	Conclusions	63
II.	PART TWO: MAJOR CONCLUSIONS AND POLICYMAKING RESPONSES	64
A.	IMPROVING THE POLICYMAKING PROCESS	64
B.	SETTING THE 1985 BASIC AGENDA	68
1.	Securing Adequate, Stable, Predictable, and Equitable Funding	68
2.	Maintaining and Improving the Quality of Programs, Services, and Employees	70
3.	Defining Mission and Priorities	72
4.	Maintaining Access During Times of Uncertainty and Change	74
5.	Clarifying and Improving Governance	74
6.	Improving the Effectiveness of State Agency Operations	76
NOTES		78
APPENDIX A		A-1

I. PART ONE: PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

A. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

B. STUDENTS: ACCESS AND SERVICES

C. FINANCE

D. GOVERNANCE

E. EMPLOYEES

A. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

PART ONE: PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

A. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

1. Background and Concerns

The mission of community colleges, as it relates to educational programs, is broadly authorized but scarcely directive in statute. Section 66701 of the Education Code, derived from the original 1960 Master Plan, provides that community colleges:

> shall offer instruction through but not beyond the second year of college. These institutions may grant the associate in arts and the associate in science degree. Their program may include but shall not be limited to: standard collegiate courses for transfer to other institutions; vocational and technical fields leading to employment; general or liberal arts courses; and community services. (emphasis added)

This and other provisions of law related to community college missions and function do not indicate the priority or relative importance of the different types of courses and programs community colleges offer.[1]

Given this wide-ranging authority to educate, community colleges set out in the 1960's and 1970's to deliver a comprehensive program to their local constituencies. It was, by any standard, an era of explosive growth. During this time the number of new colleges grew from 63 to 106; and from 1970 to 1975 the total enrollment doubled.

By 1975, however, State authorities were concerned enough about the price tag for fulfilling this educational mission that they imposed a five percent growth cap on community college ADA. Throughout the remainder of the 1970's and into the 1980's, the community college finance mechanism has been used to directly and indirectly limit the educational mission of community colleges. As noted by Patrick M. Callan, Director of California Postsecondary Education Commission:

> ...education researchers have noted that disputes over the levels and methods of funding in the community colleges often stem from unresolved differences in opinion over the mission, functions, and priorities for community college education. It seems to me that this is exactly what has happened during the past five years in California. As we have moved from the credit/noncredit issue through the implementation of the Course Classification System and the $30 million budget cut, the mission of the colleges has been defined by exclusion -- what the State won't fund -- rather than by any clear statement of statewide interests and priorities.[2]

While the mission of the colleges has been influenced by the funding mechanisms, it has much more been affected by demographic and social changes, particularly those occurring within the communities that colleges serve. It is critical to recognize that while the major components of the mission are relatively stable and defined, the emphasis on various components has changed from time to time in response to demographic and societal changes. In this regard, while the mission can be defined, it becomes problematic to legislatively fix the emphases or priorities within it -- because to do so would inhibit the ability to meet emerging educational needs.

Regarding the current emphasis among components of the mission, course classification data demonstrate the following major breakdowns:

- Over 145,000 courses are offered by community colleges, with about 90% of these being credit offerings, and about 10% being noncredit.

- About 55% of all credit instruction is in the liberal arts and sciences category, and another 35% or more of all credit instruction is in the occupational category.

- Developmental education (Compensatory and Adult, Elementary and Secondary) constitutes about 7% of all credit and noncredit instruction; while Community or Continuing Education (Personal Development, Parenting, Community and Civic Development) constitutes about 4% of all instruction.[3]

Given this background, there is a list of more specific issues that have been raised regarding the educational programs of community colleges:

a. *Clarification of the Mission:* There is a lack of consensus or validation regarding the appropriate educational mission of community colleges, as well as priorities within that mission.[4] This lack of consensus or validation exists within the Legislature; between the legislative and executive branches of government; and between the Board of Governors, districts, the other segments of education, and the legislative and executive branches of government.

b. *Academic Quality of Offerings:* A concern exists that the academic rigor or quality of community colleges offerings has diminished or has been watered down to the level of the student.[5]

c. *Remediation:* There are perceptions that community colleges are providing too much remedial instruction (and thus losing their character as colleges), that remedial instruction is being offered for credit, and that remediation responsibilities are not well coordinated among the segments.[6]

d. *The Transfer Function:* A fairly prevalent concern exists that community colleges have become inattentive to the transfer function -- that the transfer courses and programs have declined in quality -- and that the transfer rate to four-year colleges is too low, particularly among minorities.[7]

e. *The Vocational Education Function:* There is a concern over the apparent lack of coordination among many vocational providers, concern regarding the currency of programs and instructors, and concern whether existing programs are training students for skills with labor market needs.[8]

f. *Program Mix:* A perception continues to linger that the program mix or program balance of community colleges is too heavy in the area of recreational and avocational offerings.[9]

g. *Duplication of Offerings:* There is a concern that community colleges duplicate program offerings of other educational providers who can deliver such programs at less State expense.[10] This concern is usually raised in connection with vocational education, employment training and adult education offerings.

h. *Program Review and Planning:* A belief exists that community colleges are inattentive to the currency of their programs, particularly with respect to labor market needs and program review,[11] and that community colleges are not changing their mission to attend to societal needs for education in the future.[12]

i. *The Meaning of the Associate Degree:* There is a growing concern that the associate degree is losing its meaning or integrity as a degree in itself.[13]

j. *Articulation:* There is a perceived lack of articulation between community colleges and school districts, as well as between community colleges and four-year colleges; and there is a perceived lack of intersegmental cooperation at the State level.[14]

2. Past and Present Efforts to Address Concerns

The following is a summary of state-level responses to the concerns that have just been identified. A multitude of local-level responses to these concerns have also occurred, although no attempt has been made to compile or analyze them. In this regard, it needs to be recognized that in various districts, many or most of these concerns may have already been responded to. The discussion in this document is not intended to intimate that local efforts do not exist; rather, it is intended to focus on what has been done at the state level (affecting all colleges) to address these concerns.

a. *Clarification of the Mission:* There have been at least three critical developments since 1981 that have helped or will help to clarify the mission.

(1) *Course Classification:* An important step towards clarifying the community college mission was taken with the 1981 legislative mandate (AB 1626, Chapter 103) requiring community colleges to classify their credit, noncredit and community service offerings and activities in accordance with a classification structure adopted by the Board of Governors. All community colleges responded, and more than 145,000 credit and noncredit courses and over 6,000 community service classes were included in the classification.

The course classification file, updated annually, is an important tool for determining more precisely the nature and extent of the various programs being provided by the colleges. Earlier, the curriculum content had to be gauged by the level of credit and noncredit offerings, a very imprecise and inappropriate measure.

(2) *Statewide Mission Statement:* A second step towards clarifying the mission came in December 1983, when the Board culminated a 16-month effort to develop a Statewide Mission Statement for Community Colleges (Appendix A). Importantly, the Statement identifies the various programmatic and service functions for community colleges and indicates whether they "will" or "should" be provided. While these indications of priority do not have the force and effect of law, they are being used by the Board as it develops its Basic Agenda as well as its statewide priorities for the comprehensive planning process (see infra).

(3) *Mission and Master Plan Review:* A third and critical step towards clarifying the mission occurred with the enactment of legislation to review the mission of community colleges along with the Master Plan for Higher Education (SB 1570, SB 2064, ACR 162 -- 1984). The Board had called for this review in its 1984 Basic Agenda.

By December 31, 1985, a 16-member Commission for Review of the Master Plan is to assess the mission of community colleges and report its findings and recommendations to a 14-member Joint Legislative Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Postsecondary Education.[15] The assessment is to include, but not be limited to, all of the following:

(A) A comparison of the statutory directives regarding the programs and activities required to be offered by community colleges, and the programs and activities actually offered by community colleges.

(B) An assessment of, and recommendations regarding, the appropriateness of all of the following programs,

courses, and activities to the mission of the community colleges, particularly with respect to the functions of other state educational institutions, and the priorities which should be given to all of the following programs, courses, and activities:

Transfer programs.
Vocational programs.
Programs leading to associate degrees.
Certificate programs leading to employment.
General education courses.
Remedial and basic skills courses.
Noncredit courses.
Fee-supported community services courses.
Student services, including, but not limited to, counseling, testing, job placement, and financial aid.
Other programs, courses, and activities currently offered by community colleges.

(C) An assessment of the current socioeconomic composition of community college students, and recommendations for methods to ensure that all California residents will have access to community college programs and services.

(D) Policy recommendations designed to ensure that the academic quality of community college programs and courses will be maintained and enhanced.

(E) Other policy recommendations regarding the mission of the community colleges or community college operations the Commission deems appropriate.

By March 1, 1987, the Joint Committee is to submit recommendations to the Legislature based on all reports received from the Commission. It is not clear whether legislative action on the community college mission portion of the review will need to await this deadline.

b. *Academic Quality of Offerings:* There exists no definitive data or study documenting that the quality of community college course offerings is inadequate.

With respect to consumer and public satisfaction, to the contrary, a 1983 survey conducted by Larry Eastland and Associates revealed that the community colleges were rated by almost 80% of the respondents as being good or excellent in their quality of education. The results of this survey corroborate an earlier study conducted by the Field Research Corporation in 1979.[16]

The conclusion that community college offerings lack rigor or quality has been inferred from data on transfer rates of community college students as well as data on the performance of community college students once they transfer. Recent data about transfer rates and the performance of transfer students dispel this conclusion.[17]

Based on information from the University of California, after one year of attendance the grade point averages (GPA) of community college students who were eligible to attend UC upon graduation are virtually the same as students who enroll at UC as freshmen; and the GPA's of students who were not eligible to attend UC upon graduation from high school are similar to those of other students who transfer from four-year colleges and universities.[18] Similar information from the California State University system shows that community college transfer students do as well as those students who began at CSU as freshmen.

Other observers contend that community colleges have lowered the quality and rigor of offerings in order to reach students who aren't prepared or shouldn't be in college.[19] Again, while this contention has yet to be validated, there is significant concern about it.

Working with community college educators, the Board is currently responding in at least two ways to assure rigor and excellence in community college programs.

(1) *Academic Rigor Standards:* In early 1983 the Board of Governors created a broad-based Task Force on Academic Quality, one of whose charges was to focus on standards for baccalaureate and associate degree level courses. The Task Force is working with representatives of UC and CSU to formulate uniform standards to ensure that courses in all three segments of public postsecondary education are characterized by the same or similar standards of rigor.

Recommendations of the Task Force are now being reviewed and discussed by the Board of Governors. These include criteria to assure that degree-applicable courses are indeed collegiate level, and that certain remedial courses are not applicable to the degree. The recommendations will be drafted into regulations which are planned for adoption in the late spring or early summer of 1985.

(2) *Priorities for Excellence:* Also, as a part of its 1984 Basic Agenda, the Board adopted a priority to strengthen the quality and vitality of the transfer function, as well as a priority to strengthen the quality of vocational education and employment training. These priorities were established not from a conclusion that the transfer and vocational education programs were weak or poor in quality, but rather from a determination that these programs needed to be excellent.

c. *Remediation:* In a 1982 study entitled, "Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities," the Postsecondary Education Commission expressed concerns about the extensive amount of lower level (sub-collegiate) instruction that is being provided by the community colleges.

The Board of Governors has taken notice of the fact that the rising prominence of remediation as a necessary function of postsecondary education has tended to blur the distinctions between what is and what is not "collegiate level" work, thereby appearing to lower the standards of institutions and create confusion or false standards among students. It has responded by charging the Task Force on Academic Quality to examine remediation in the community colleges, and to recommend necessary policy reforms.

The work of the Task Force on remediation issues was summarized to the Board at its January 1985 meeting, with action scheduled for later in the spring. Potential reforms for adoption include a definition of "remediation"; a policy statement on the role and purposes of providing remediation; and standards for intersegmental efforts to coordinate the delivery of remediation within regions, including efforts to assist in improving preparation of high school students.

d. *The Transfer Function:* Interest in the viability of the community college transfer function was heightened as a result of two reports issued in 1981. The Postsecondary Education Commission's annual report on community college transfer rates showed a decline in the number of transfers from the community colleges to the University of California and a similar, though less dramatic, reduction in the number of transfers to the California State University. These two institutions historically receive the vast majority of community college transfers to four-year institutions.

The second report was developed by the University of California and known as the "Kissler Report," (formally, "Report of the Task Group on Retention and Transfer," June 1980). This report raised questions about the rate of persistence and quality of performance of community college transfers to campuses of the University. Although the report's findings, as well as its methodology, were aggressively questioned by the community college community, it served, along with the CPEC data on rate of transfer, to encourage closer scrutiny of the community college transfer function.

Following the 1981 publication by the Chancellor and the President of the University of California of a joint statement of their intent to improve the transfer rate of community college students to UC and other four-year institutions, staff conducted a survey of community college practices regarding institutional identification and assistance of transfer students.

This study, reported to the Board of Governors in September of 1982, led to a clear recognition of the need to improve the quality and vitality of the community college transfer function.

In adopting its 1984 Basic Agenda, the Board established the transfer function as a "priority for emphasis," and requested districts to undertake actions to develop, improve or otherwise emphasize this function.

The Board also set its own priority to "strengthen the quality and vitality of the community college transfer function." The plan for addressing this priority calls for a series of actions, most of which involve cooperative efforts among the segments. Some of the more immediate objectives in the plan are to increase the minority transfer rate and develop ways to better identify and assist potential transfer students. The plan also notes issues that need further study, pointing first to the need to establish an appropriate baseline upon which to calculate the community college transfer rate and the performance of transfer students, and against which future efforts to improve the transfer function can be measured. Finally, the plan emphasizes the importance of the matriculation process in helping to identify and assist potential transfer students.[20]

Also, in December of 1983, the Postsecondary Education Commission established an "Ad Hoc Committee on Community College Transfer" to assess the health of the function, examine policy issues and problems related to transfer, and make recommendations. The work product of the Committee has been condensed into a report which is scheduled to be adopted by the Postsecondary Education Commission early in 1985. The report makes clear that no one segment bears responsibility for transfer programs, and that success or failure of efforts to improve depend on the cooperation of all segments. Many of the recommendations contained in the report call for intersegmental cooperative efforts and deliberations, with a few proposals for legislation.

e. *Vocational Education and Employment Training:* During the late 1970's and early 1980's, the Legislature expressed increasing concern over the apparent lack of coordination among vocational education providers such as K-12 districts, community college districts, Regional Occupational Centers, and apprenticeship councils. Concerns were also raised about the currency of programs, and whether students were being trained for jobs with labor market demands.

With the passage of the federal Job Training Partnership Act in 1982, and its implementation through state law in 1983, there emerged an even greater need for coordination, both at the state administrative level and the local delivery level.

By April of 1983 the Assembly Office of Research released a report (Training Tomorrow's Workers) condemning the present structure and calling for a single comprehensive state system. The proposals in this report were subsequently placed into legislation (preprint AB 1). On another front, the California Advisory Council on Vocational Education also developed a comprehensive proposal (SB 610) to address legislative concerns. This proposal, too, had negative implications for community colleges.

With the Federal Vocational Education Act due to be reauthorized in 1984, and with a widespread realization that there was still a compelling need for the community colleges to have a comprehensive policy on vocational education, two events happened during late 1983: first, in October, the Board of Governors committed itself to develop a comprehensive policy statement on vocational education; and second, an Occupational Education Coalition of community college groups was formed in November of 1983. During 1984, the Occupational Education Coalition worked to overcome many of the erroneous perceptions about community college occupational programs. As a result, neither preprint AB 1 nor SB 610 moved.

In adopting its 1984 Basic Agenda, the Board adopted two priorities related to vocational education. First, it established the vocational education function as a priority for emphasis, requesting districts to undertake actions to develop, improve or otherwise emphasize this function; and second, the Board established a priority to strengthen the quality of vocational education and employment training programs in the community colleges. In this latter regard, the Board noted its commitment to develop a comprehensive policy statement on vocational education and employment training.

At its March 1984 meeting the Board adopted the comprehensive position statement which, notably, called for community colleges to serve as the primary and presumptive delivery system for adult vocational education and employment training programs in California; established plans for developing linkages between the private sector and community college districts; committed the Board to develop staffing and personnel standards, as well as an in-service training program; and called for the development of specific evaluation and accountability proposals.[21] A document detailing strategies to implement the comprehensive policy was developed in the ensuing months, and is now being followed.

During 1984, there were no successful proposals which called for the kinds of drastic reorganization or consolidation of vocational education and employment training that had been proposed the year before. However, two aspects of the Board's comprehensive policy were enacted. AB 3938 (Chapter 1662) establishes a $500,000 Community College Vocational Education

and Technology Instructor and Counselor In-Service Training Program. It also requires a study of contract education in the community colleges.

In October 1984, the President signed the Reauthorization of the federal Vocational Education Act. Among other things, the new Act changes various timelines for planning as well as various submittal dates; workload for achieving compliance will be especially heavy during early 1985.

During October and December of 1984 the Board considered and adopted a proposal to expand the membership and jurisdiction of the Joint Advisory Policy Council to include members of the State Job Training Coordinating Council and to increase the kinds of matters it deals with. The Board also provided a special project grant to conduct a comprehensive study of the status of vocational education in the community colleges. Finally, the Board also broadened a student placement and follow-up project to include 26 colleges. This critical project is designed to improve the rate of response on follow-up activities, determine student completer and leaver satisfaction with vocational programs and employer satisfaction with recent program completers.

In sum, during 1984 much was done to improve the perception of community college vocational programs; also, the groundwork for future quality improvements was laid with the development and continuing implementation of the comprehensive statement.

f. *Program Mix:* As State funds dwindled during 1981 and 1982, lawmakers became increasingly concerned over what was perceived to be an inordinate number of recreational or avocational courses being offered by community colleges at State expense.[22] In June of 1982 the Legislature adopted budget bill language which reduced apportionments by $30 million and required the Board of Governors to specify which courses would not be eligible for state aid in 1982-83. The Board decided that of the options contained in the budget bill language the major effort would be directed at identification of recreational, avocational, and personal development courses which could appropriately be offered as community services classes on a fee basis.

In about 30 days the Board acted to fulfill its responsibility, and in the ensuing months the course cuts were identified and accomplished. Over 5,600 courses were eliminated from the credit and noncredit curriculum of colleges, most of which are now being offered on a fee basis as community services classes.

In June of 1983, the Board adopted a regulation that prohibits all state aid (ADA) for repetition of credit courses except under specifically limited circumstances (See Section 58161 of Title 5). Then, in 1984, the Board sponsored successful legislation (AB 3776, Chapter 1401) which authorizes districts to

charge fees to students who audit credit courses. These auditors will not generate ADA. Also in 1984, legislation was passed (AB 1379, Chapter 268) which prohibits districts from expending State General Fund (apportionment) monies to establish and maintain community service classes.

The three changes described above have done much to curtail state subsidy of purely recreational or avocational offerings, as well as state subsidy for repeated enrollment of courses. Therefore, the realignment of the program mix brought about by the $30 million course deletion should remain intact. Recent course reinstatement and classification data support this conclusion.[23]

g. *Duplication of Offerings:* While there lingers a perception that community colleges unnecessarily duplicate program offerings of other providers, and that some of these offerings could be provided at less expense by others, there is little current evidence to support this perception. Changes enacted during the past few years appear to have addressed this concern.

While various providers (particularly K-12 districts) have similar program authority in vocational education, employment training and adult education, the fiscal and programmatic advantages and disadvantages of one segment over the other appear to have been neutralized. With respect to noncredit offerings, the list of what the state will support and the rate at which it will pay have been nearly identical since the passage of AB 1626 (Chapter 103, Statutes of 1981). With respect to credit offerings, it should be recognized that community college revenues per ADA do not differ substantially from K-12 revenues per ADA, and are actually less in terms of statewide averages.[24]

The upcoming community college mission review and the review of the Master Plan will specifically focus on the respective roles of the various educational providers, including K-12 districts. Since the community college mission portion will be accomplished by December 31, 1985, it makes sense that any concerns about duplication should be addressed in this review, and await its outcome.

h. *Program Review and Planning:* There is no definitive documentation or analysis on the extent to which community colleges review their programs to assure continuing need and currency. All districts are required to plan in several areas, including educational programs, facilities, affirmative action, vocational education, EOPS, disabled students, and others. During recent years, however, course and program approval activity has declined in the Chancellor's Office, suggesting that district course offerings have become more static. It should be recognized, however, that given the severe fiscal limitations of recent years, given the lateness when funding levels are finally determined, and given a finance mechanism which is

based on average daily attendance, it has been difficult to plan. Also, there is no current fiscal incentive for districts to expend resources for program review and planning -- because to do so will require resources to be diverted away from revenue generating activities.

The Board has been concerned about program review and planning for several years, and has taken several steps to assure that both functions occur.

(1) *Comprehensive Planning:* With adoption of its Long-Term Finance Plan in September, 1979, the Board of Governors recognized the need for a statewide planning and accountability process. Considerable effort was being spent on review and approval of particular proposals for programs, facilities, categorical programs, etc.; but little or no emphasis was being placed on subsequent evaluation; and little or no time was spent on assessing how these particular proposals fit into overall district and statewide priorities.

In what has come to be called the "comprehensive planning project," the Board of Governors is taking steps to consolidate various heretofore separate planning processes into a single planning document. A key element of the new process will involve district planning and evaluation around "statewide priorities" which are identified by the Board of Governors.[25] Currently, this comprehensive planning process is being field tested in selected districts, with more complete implementation scheduled for the 1986-87 fiscal year. Resources for this undertaking are being sought for the 1985-86 fiscal year.

(2) *Evaluation of Programs and Services -- FIPSE Project:* Like the Board of Governors, the entity which accredits community colleges (the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges -- ACCJC) has similar responsibilities regarding planning and evaluation. College officials have complained of the duplication of effort, particularly the expense and time, to meet these similar requirements. They object to limited resources being spent on duplicate accountability concerns rather than on the delivery of educational programs.

In 1981 the Chancellor's Office and ACCJC applied for and received federal funding from the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to jointly pursue a project related to planning and evaluation in the community colleges. The basic thrust of the project is to analyze the current respective planning and evaluation responsibilities of the Board of Governors and the Accrediting Commission, and to more clearly and effectively delineate

the appropriate roles of the state agency and the accreditation process. Another important outcome of this project, which is scheduled to culminate in 1985, will be to strengthen the accreditation process and thereby improve its use as an accountability mechanism.

(3) *Future Study:* In March of 1984, the Board initiated a project to assist both itself and the colleges in identifying important trends of the future, as well as the implications of these trends for community colleges.[26] This project will focus on demographic, economic, social, educational, technological and other trends to the year 2000; and will explore what community colleges should be doing to be responsive to them. The results will be made available to districts for use in comprehensive planning. The results will also assist the Board in its continuing review of the mission and its development of the annual Basic Agenda.

(4) *Minimum Standard for Program Review:* In March of 1984, the Board adopted a regulation which requires districts, as a condition of receiving state aid, to develop and carry out a policy for program review (See Section 51022 of Title 5).

i. *Meaning of the Associate Degree:* During the latter part of the 1970's increasing concerns began to be raised, particularly among educators, about the meaning and integrity of the associate degree. The concerns related essentially to how the associate degree was being perceived by four-year transfer institutions, prospective employers, students themselves and the general public. Perceptions were that general education requirements were minimal, electives were too permissive, and that many offerings that could count toward the associate degree did not have a collegiate level of rigor. The degree did not appear to have much meaning as an end in itself.[27]

Responding to the concerns of community college educators, as well as the concerns of CPEC and the four-year segments, and noting the national scope of this issue, the Board of Governors has undertaken important actions during recent years.

(1) *Strengthened Graduation Requirements:* In March of 1982, after an intensive two-year review, the Board adopted a a major revision of the general education requirements for the associate degree (See Title 5, Sections 55805-55806). Significant changes included:

- a proficiency requirement in reading, writing, and mathematics;
- a new requirement in communication and analytical thinking;

- o a new English composition requirement;
- o an increase in the number of required general education semester units from 15 to 18;
- o three required general education semester units to be left to local option; and
- o a statement of general education and a requirement that each college develop and publish its own general education philosophy and standards.

(2) *Academic Rigor of Associate Degree Offerings:* In early 1983 the Board created the Task Force on Academic Quality, one of whose charges was to focus on standards for baccalaureate and associate degree level courses. The need to define standards for baccalaureate level courses was based upon the need to assure that lower division courses in all three segments of public postsecondary education are characterized by the same degree of rigor. Also, in order to more clearly establish the nature and purposes of the associate degree, it was necessary to define and establish standards for courses that should apply to that degree.

Recommendations of the Task Force are now being reviewed and discussed by the Board. These include criteria to assure that degree-applicable courses are indeed collegiate level, and that certain remedial courses are not applicable to the degree. The recommendations will be drafted into regulations which are planned for adoption in the late spring or early summer of 1985.

Recently there have been signficant developments at the national level regarding the associate degree. In 1982, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), with funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, created a National Task Force to Redefine the Associate Degree. A monograph entitled, "Redefining the Associate Degree," as well as a "Policy Statement on the Associate Degree"[28] have recently emerged from this effort, and are being reviewed by the Board and the Task Force on Academic Quality. In addition, the Board is also reviewing a "two-plus-two" or "tech prep" proposal,[29] which would combine the last two years of high school with two years of community college to culimate in a technical degree. These developments portend further activities and policy development with respect to the associate degree.

j. *Articulation:* Articulating with feeder school districts, four-year institutions and other educational entities is important not only for improving the transfer function, but also for improving the success and flow of students through the whole curriculum. Good articulation takes constant work and significant resources. Resource constraints since the passage of Proposition 13 have made it difficult for districts to fully attend to articulation needs.

Despite resource constraints, some important steps have already been taken to assure articulation:

(1) *Minimum Standard on Articulation:* In March of 1984 the Board adopted a regulation which requires districts, as a condition of receiving state aid, to develop and carry out a policy to articulate their courses and programs with proximate four-year colleges and high schools (See Section 51022 of Title 5).

(2) *State Staffing:* A position in the Chancellor's Office to attend to statewide articulation needs, as well as to facilitate local efforts, was funded beginning in 1984-85.

(3) *Academic Partnership:* AB 2398 (Chapter 620), which provides funding for cooperative efforts between schools and colleges to improve the preparation of K-12 students for college, was enacted in 1984. This measure should encourage articulation with school districts.

(4) *Articulation with Four-Year Colleges:* During 1984, legislation (AB 3950) which required specified articulation efforts to occur between UC, CSU and the community colleges was vetoed. Intersegmental efforts to voluntarily improve articulation are proceeding, however.

3. Conclusions

Before identifying conclusions that emerge from this review of past and present efforts, an important point about the interrelationship of concerns and responses needs to be made. Not only the concerns but also the responses are interrelated. For example, some of the concerns about the transfer function could be discussed under articulation. Concerns about program mix could also be discussed in terms of the mission, or in terms of the lack of emphasis on the transfer function. Concerns about remediation could also be discussed under academic quality and rigor, the meaning of the associate degree, or duplication of offerings.

Realizing the interrelatedness of the concerns becomes especially important when determining further responses or solutions. Care needs to be taken to respond to the concerns as interrelated, not as they stand separately. Otherwise there may well be multiple responses to what may be a single, basic concern which is simply described in different ways.

Several conclusions emerge from this comprehensive review of concerns and responses related to educational programs:

First, with respect to many of the concerns discussed, perceptions and opinion as opposed to documentation and analysis, have been the basis for many state-level responses. The lack of data and analysis have exacerbated tendencies to rely on anecdotal evidence. Also, incorrect, inaccurate, or outdated perceptions have been difficult to refute without current and reliable data.

Misperceptions that should be clarified include: the perception that community college educational offerings are of low quality, the perception that there is no coordination among vocational providers, and the perception that colleges provide extensive recreational and avocational offerings at the expense of the State.

Second, from this review of concerns and responses it is apparent that some of them do not require additional immediate attention. In light of reforms enacted during recent years, concerns about program mix, duplication of offerings, and program review and planning have been adequately addressed for the near future (at least through 1985).

Third, the review of the community college mission by the Commission for Review of the Master Plan will require an active presence of the Board during 1985. The Commission, in addressing the mission, will also develop important recommendations on priorities within the mission, methods to ensure access, and ways to ensure the academic quality of programs.

The most potentially far-reaching action of the Commission will involve recommendation of mission priorities by the Commission. The Board has recognized that while the components of the mission are relatively stable and defined, the emphasis on various program components has changed from time to time in response to demographic and societal changes, and also to reflect the special needs of the many communities the colleges serve. Priorities within the mission should not, therefore, be fixed in statute. Rather, the Board of Governors and districts should play an active role in establishing clear priorities, and defining what these priorities mean.

Fourth, the focus on excellence of programs should be continued with respect to the transfer and vocational functions, and expanded to other programmatic functions, so that confidence in the quality of community college offerings is strengthened. Evidence about success in the transfer, vocational education and other functions needs to be highlighted and disseminated.

Fifth, development of Board policy on the appropriate purposes and structure of remediation in the community colleges should be completed, by mid-year at the latest, so that it can be made available to the Commission for Review of the Master Plan.

Sixth, a comprehensive approach to incorporating community college, Board and CPEC recommendations regarding the transfer function needs to be determined and carried out. Intersegmental efforts to establish transfer centers should be funded. In general, intersegmental efforts rather than legislation appear to be the best approach.

Seventh, Board policy on the meaning of the associate degree and the rigor of community college course offerings should be adopted.

And, *eighth*, additional resources for planning, program review and articulation must be secured.

B. STUDENTS: ACCESS AND SERVICES

1. Background and Concerns

The mission of community colleges, as it relates to the students they are to serve, is generally contained in Section 76000 of the Education Code, which provides, in part:

> The governing board of a community college district...shall admit to the community college any California resident, and may admit any nonresident, possessing a high school diploma or the equivalent thereof.
>
> . . .
>
> The governing board may by rule determine whether there shall be admitted to the community college any person who is over 18 years of age and who, in the judgment of the board...is capable of profiting from the instruction offered. (emphasis added)

Section 76000 is related to Section 66201, which is part of the Master Plan, and which reflects the "open door" concept for public higher education in California.

> 66201. It is the intent of the Legislature that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education should have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education. Once enrolled he should have the opportunity to continue as long and as far as his capacity and motivations, as indicated by his academic performance and commitment to educational advancement, will lead him to meet academic standards and institutional requirements.
>
> The Legislature hereby reaffirms the commitment of the State of California to provide an appropriate place in California public higher education for every student who is willing and able to benefit from attendance. (emphasis added).

Under provisions of the Master Plan it was thus intended that community colleges should serve as the "open door," to give an opportunity to every person who had the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education. Meanwhile, more rigorous admissions standards were to be established by the University of California and the California State University, so that they drew from the top 12% and 33% of high school graduates, respectively. Studies show that about 60% of all high school graduates go directly on to college, and that 7 out of every 10 (70%) of these college-bound students go to a community college.[30]

Essentially, then, the law requires that community college districts must admit any person possessing a high school diploma or the equivalent, and they should admit (if the intent of Section 66201 is to be carried out) any person over 18 who is capable of profiting, in the district's judgment, from the instruction offered. Neither the statutes nor the regulations of the Board of Governors establish a definition of or parameters for the term "capable of profiting from the instruction offered."

But community colleges, of course, serve more than recent high school graduates. Given their broad educational mission, and given their responsibility to meet the commitment to the open door, California community colleges have provided unparalleled access to public higher education. As many as one out of every 12 California adults enrolls in a community college annually, and one out of every two Californians attends a community college in his or her lifetime. Over 75% of the total ethnic minority population in public higher education, including 82% of all Blacks and 88% of all Hispanics who attend college, are enrolled in community colleges.[31] Also, over 35% of all students attending community colleges are 30 or more years old.

One consequence of providing the open door is that the community college student population is extremely diverse in terms of educational background, skills, abilities, interests and motivations. This diversity has important ramifications for classroom instruction; it also requires a broader array of student support services than would be needed with a more homogeneous student population.

A second, and equally important, consequence of providing the open door is that community colleges serve a disproportionate number of "high risk" students:

> Whatever they are called, these students have been perceived as less likely than their better-prepared counterparts to succeed in any given college course and consequently less likely to continue through a standard sequence of courses from term to term (Romoser, 1978). Academically, these students lack a solid educational base for success. They have poor study habits and lack basic reading, writing, and computational skills (Kraetsch, 1980). Most have had less than favorable learning conditions during their elementary and secondary school years. Most are from the bottom third of their high school class (Campbell, 1981). Psychologically, these students have little confidence in their ability to learn and generally suffer from a low self-image. In class they are seldom active participants and are reluctant to admit they need help (Friedlander, 1981-82). In the major urban areas, these are largely minority students whose educational and psychological handicaps are exacerbated by economic, social, and racial factors.[32]

High risk students, even those with high raw intelligence, are less persistent than other students; and they need more support services. The challenge is great, but at least in past years, community colleges have earned high marks in serving such students:

> The community college's reputation for excellence in teaching is due in large measure to its commitment to meeting the needs of students with highly diverse educational backgrounds and wider ranges of skills, abilities, interests, and motivations than are usually found among students in collegiate institutions. These colleges enroll students irrespective of their mastery of the basic skills needed for college-level work and help them progress as far as their motivation and ability will sustain them. In doing so, community colleges do not abandon academic standards or faculty expectations about student achievement. Instead, they practice flexibility in working with students who do not -- and may not ever -- fit the traditional model of a college or university student.[33]

Most of the funding to provide necessary support services to this diverse and disproportionately high risk student population is provided through the general apportionment mechanism, which is driven largely by classroom attendance (ADA). The Extended Opportunity Programs and Services and Handicapped Students Programs and Services are categorical programs that provide supplemental services to special populations, but the bulk of support for student services generally must come out of general ADA support.

Funding constraints since Proposition 13 have diminished the ability of community colleges to provide access and student services. Legislative policies restricting the educational mission and adding fees have also undoubtedly affected access. While it is difficult to count those who are turned away and those who decide not to come, the enrollments (fall term) since 1977 provide an important picture:

1977	1,321,739	
1978	1,159,819	(first enrollment decline since the 1940's)
1979	1,248,459	
1980	1,384,068	
1981	1,430,711	
1982	1,354,949	(second ever enrollment decline)
1983	1,228,502	(third ever enrollment decline)
1984	1,105,700	(estimate) (fourth ever enrollment decline)

STUDENTS: ACCESS AND SERVICES

Enrollment levels from 1981-82 have fallen more than 20% in three years, and fall 1984 enrollments were below the post-Proposition 13 level of 1978.

Given this background, there is a list of specific concerns that have been raised regarding students and student services in the community colleges:

a. *Lack of Data:* As enrollment levels have declined for three straight years, it becomes critical to know who is not attending, why they are not attending, and what they would have been taking had they attended. If eligible students are choosing not to attend because of fees, or because they aren't getting the kinds of support services they need to persist, there is cause for immediate concern. Similarly, there is reason for concern if fiscal cuts have forced program reductions in essential areas of the curriculum, causing students to be turned away or to decide not to come. On the other hand, if "casual" or "recreational" students are choosing not to come, or if the improved economy and lower unemployment rate mean fewer people need job skills or retraining, or if students are simply deciding to go to other educational providers, there is less reason for concern.

   The current ongoing data gathering mechanisms do not provide the information necessary to make the determinations described above.

b. *Casual and Recreational Students:* Despite several reforms and fiscal adjustments, there lingers a perception that there are too many "casual" students (without an extended educational purpose or any significant motivation) attending community colleges, as well as too many "recreational students" (primarily seeking personal enjoyment) attending community colleges. This perception has affected both funding levels and the overall perception of community colleges.

c. *Capacity to Profit from Instruction:* There is a lack of consensus regarding which students community colleges should provide with remediation, basic skills, and the like. There is a concern that too many students who attend community colleges are not sufficiently prepared or equipped to benefit from college level education.[34]

d. *Adequacy of Student Services:* There is a concern that student services have declined and have been disproportionately reduced during the last several years; and that access, retention, and student success rates have declined as a result.[35]

e. *Student Financial Aid:* There is a concern that there has been inadequate attention to the costs of attending a community college, that current student financial aid resources and delivery systems are inadequate.[36]

2. Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns

The following is a summary of state-level responses to the concerns that have been identified. A multitude of local-level responses to these concerns have also occurred, although no attempt has been made to compile or analyze them. In this regard, it needs to be recognized that in various districts, many or most of these concerns may have already been responded to. The discussion in this document is not intended to intimate that local efforts do not exist; rather, it is intended to focus on what has been done at the state level (affecting all colleges) to address these concerns.

a. *Lack of Data:* The Chancellor's Office, through its Information System, collects data regarding each student, including age, sex, ethnicity, unit load, high school of graduation, and prior colleges of attendance. Information on such other factors as the student's educational goal, course enrollments, income, and past academic performance has not been consistently collected. District response to any of these data collection requests is not mandatory; nor are districts funded in any direct way for the provision of data.

Other data available on student goals come from a Statewide Longitudinal Study (SLS) conducted between 1978-1981, which was based on a sample of students from a group of 15 colleges. Data on income is available through the Student Expense and Resource Survey (SEARS), administered by the Student Aid Commission. Neither of these data sources has been considered entirely reliable.

Without census data on students' income levels and educational goals, and the capability to correlate such data with other data already collected such as ethnicity and credit load, it is not possible on a continuing basis to analyze enrollment patterns and changes. For instance, if a ten percent enrollment drop occurs one year, it is very important to be able to determine whether the loss was disproportionate among persons with less than $12,000 annual income, or among full-time Hispanics with transfer objectives, or among high-income degree-holding whites.

Two important steps are taking place to improve data:

(1) *AB IXX Student Fee Impact Study:* As a part of the funding and fee compromise enacted in January of 1984, the Legislature appropriated $115,000 for the Chancellor to conduct a study of the impact of the $50 fee, to be completed by July 1, 1987. Early discussions recognized that new income and educational objective data would be needed to do any kind of satisfactory study. Accordingly, the Chancellor's Office contracted with the Field Research Corporation, early in 1984, to survey over 10,000 students in 62 colleges. The results of the survey, released in October of 1984, provide new and reliable data on student income

levels and educational goals.[37] Since the survey was conducted before the $50 fee became effective, it will provide baseline data to measure changes occurring as of spring 1985 and spring 1986 (when the survey will be repeated).

(2) *Information System: Phase II:* In connection with the 1985-86 Budget process, the Board submitted the first part of a four-year proposal to improve the Information System. This proposal will improve the quality, reporting compliance and applications of data for analysis, as well as the planning and operating functions of the office. Matriculation and student financial aid information would be added to the system, as would term end reporting.

b. *Casual and Recreational Students:* The concern that community colleges serve too many casual or recreational students at state expense grew out of the mid-to-late 1970's with the expansion of such now infamous offerings as macrame and basket-weaving. Another variation of this concern emerged in the late 1970's, with the contention that students could attend community colleges indefinitely, even if they weren't performing academically.

A number of steps have been taken that have the effect of eliminating state support for the attendance of casual or recreational students.

(1) *Grading Policies:* A major effort to improve student performance involved strengthening the standards of scholarship (grading policies) that all California community colleges are required to apply. After a year and a half of intensive study and debate, the Board adopted, in early 1980, some critical regulatory reforms. The new regulations require, at a minimum, that students falling below a "C" average (2.0) be put on probation, and that students falling below a 1.75 grade point average (over a specified number of quarters or semesters) must be dismissed. Standards for probation and dismissal were also adopted for students who receive too many W's (withdrawals), I's (incompletes), or NC's (no credit). A systemwide grading scale, which includes the "F" grade, was also defined and mandated for use by colleges. Finally, in most instances districts were authorized to adopt even stricter standards than these minimums (See Title 5, Sections 55754-55759).

These grading policy revisions address several of the concerns that had been raised about community college students. The required use of a uniform grading scale that includes the "F" grade works to identify and limit casual or ill-prepared students; while the probation and dismissal standards apply to students who might otherwise remain indefinitely (perpetual students).

(2) *Reduction in Recreational and Avocational Offerings:* A second step, as previously described, was the $30 million reduction in recreational and avocational courses that occurred in 1982-83. Removing these offerings from the curriculum also reduced the number of recreational students.

(3) *Tuition, Community Services Fees, Auditor's Fees, Drop Fees and Course Repetition:* With recreational and avocational courses being shifted to community service classes, they became fee supported. Legislation enacted in 1984, (SB 1379, Chapter 268) prohibits State General Fund revenues from being used to establish and maintain community service classes. Hence, these recreational offerings are no longer supported by the General Fund.

Other 1984 legislation (AB 3776, Chapter 1401) also authorized districts to charge a fee for students who audit courses. These auditors will not generate state support (ADA).

Also in 1984, of course, tuition was imposed. A student must now be serious enough about taking a credit class that he or she is willing to pay for it.

A $10 per course "drop fee" was mandated by SB 851 (Chapter 565) in 1983. This fee was enacted to encourage students to seriously consider their course choices and to limit "course shopping."

Finally, in 1983, the Board adopted a regulation which prohibited state aid for course repetition except under specifically limited circumstances (See Section 58161 of Title 5).

Collectively, these five changes have done much to remove state support for the attendance of persons who enroll for purely recreational and avocational purposes.

(4) *Matriculation:* The matriculation model, which emerged in April of 1984 from a study mandated by the Legislature (SB 851, Chapter 565, Statutes of 1983), provides a structure for strengthening and improving student-college interaction so as to ensure focus on and assistance to students able and willing to profit from instruction.[38] Existing student support services would be augmented and realigned so that students will declare educational goals, be assessed and counseled, and be required to make progress towards their goals.

The model, which was also developed by the Board in furtherance of its 1984 Basic Agenda theme to develop policies to help districts improve the performance of students, was placed into legislation (AB 2638) and passed to the Governor, who subsequently vetoed it.

The recent survey of students by Field Research Corporation (spring, 1984) provides further evidence that most students are not attending community colleges for recreational or avocational purposes. When surveyed about their reasons for attending, 31% of all students report they are preparing for transfer; 49% report they are upgrading job skills, training for a new and different career, or training for a first job; 6% report they are seeking basic language or computational skills; and the remainder (14%) report they are attending for a variety of other reasons. The results of this survey indicate a shift in students' reasons for attending community colleges.[39]

c. *Capacity to Profit from Instruction:* The concern that there are too many students attending community colleges who are not sufficiently prepared or equipped to benefit from college-level instruction is not so much that these people shouldn't be served, but rather that community colleges may not be the appropriate educational entity to be serving them. The concern also relates to the previously addressed issue of whether colleges are constrained to water down the quality of their offerings to the level of the poorly prepared student.

Several steps have been taken or are being taken to address the issue of capacity to profit from instruction.

(1) *Grading Policies:* The 1980 grading policy reforms, as previously summarized, require the dismissal of students who don't maintain a specified grade point average over a specified period of semesters or quarters. Generally speaking, students falling below a 1.75 grade point average after three consecutive semesters must be dismissed. Ill prepared students thus do not linger indefinitely.

(2) *Counseling Minimum Standards:* A second effort of the Board of Governors has been the development of certain requirements regarding counseling. In March of 1983 the Board adopted a regulation which requires (as a condition of districts' receiving State aid) that first-time students taking more than six units, as well as students on probation, be provided with specified counseling services. This regulation helps to assure that students are receiving necessary guidance and follow-up, and that they understand what is expected of them in order to remain in college.

(3) *Matriculation:* The matriculation model, as described earlier, involves a component for assessment of entering students. This assessment component can be used as a tool to identify students who have no chance to succeed with college-level work.

(4) *Remediation Policies:* As previously summarized, the Board's Academic Quality Task Force is developing recommended policy on the nature and extent to which community colleges should be providing remediation. By specifying the programs and services which remediation should comprise, the policies resulting from these recommendations will do much to dictate which students will be served. For instance, if a remedial floor is established, students below that floor will not be served. The recommendations on remediation will be presented to the Board early in the year, with action anticipated by late spring.

d. *Adequacy of Student Services:* A recent survey on the impact of 1982-83 Budget constraints on the community colleges found that 48% of the colleges had reduced their counseling staff, and 45% of the colleges had reduced other student support staff. Reductions in these areas were accomplished primarily through attrition and in many instances were coupled with reductions in the hours of service available to students, resulting in longer waits for counseling appointments, reduced access to learning resource centers, and the elimination or reduction of counseling and support services for special clientele, such as reentry women.[40]

The Assembly Special Committee on Community Colleges concluded in its January 1984 Report that community college student services had been historically underfunded because the State funds the colleges on the basis of student contact hours spent in the classroom and not on the basis of the level of student support services. The Report went on to explain how UC and CSU spend considerably more on student services and yet have more homogeneous and less "high risk" student populations.

Determining the resource needs for student services has been an elusive task because there is no agreement on what they should be composed of:

> No genuine consensus exists about the nature of, need for, or direction of community college student service programs. A model for change seems to elude most leaders. Those who believe that student services have never been needed more than at the present are also urging that such services be vigorously overhauled and reshaped. Others question the value and relevance of student services. Many student services professionals themselves feel beleaguered, unappreciated, and misunderstood. They do not feel that there is a promising future for them in times of tight budgets.

> Leaders of community colleges and student personnel staffs agree on one point: student services need to be redesigned. The student services function needs an infusion of new ideas, new approaches and a new reason for being.[41]

At least three steps are currently being taken to help define and fund student services:

(1) *Differential Funding:* In December 1984, the Board reviewed and generally endorsed a plan to implement differential funding in the community colleges.[42] This new funding structure has a component for student services, which will be driven by headcount enrollment adjusted by an index of need. If this concept is enacted into law, districts will receive revenues on the basis of total enrollments, in addition to revenues for classroom contact hours and other workload measures.

(2) *Matriculation:* The matriculation model adopted by the Board in April of 1984 called for a phase-in of the process over a period of several years. AB 2638 appropriated $10,000,000 for the first year of this activity, but was vetoed. The Board's Budget for 1985-86 proposes some $31 million additional to implement matriculation. These revenues would support the necessary additional student services to assess, counsel, collect data, and otherwise assist students.

(3) *Student Services Taxonomy:* In February of 1984, college student services officials, in consultation with the Chancellor's Office, developed a "Taxonomy of Services" which is now under review for potential use in comprehensive planning, differential funding cost analysis, and the Budget and Accounting Manual. The taxonomy can be an important tool for policymaking because it provides greater sophistication in identifying and describing student and instructional support services, and, in addition, clarifies how these services assist with delivering the community college mission.

e. *Student Financial Aid:* The Assembly Special Committee on Community Colleges, in its January 1984 report, concluded that California community colleges were not free (even before tuition), and that students paid to attend community colleges. It found that typical expenses included $5292 in living costs and $336 in books and supplies, and concluded that there was an unmet need of $183 million in student financial aid. The Committee went on to recommend that additional funds be given to community colleges to establish campus-based financial assistance to students.

AB 1XX, enacted in January 1984, provided $15 million a year to defray the expense of the enrollment fee for eligible community college students. Initial data indicate that students are not applying for this aid at the rate expected.[43]

3. Conclusions

Several conclusions emerge from this comprehensive review of concerns and responses related to students and student services:

First, data gathering necessary to make assessments about student concerns must be augmented and provided on an ongoing basis. Information on educational objective, student outcomes and other critical information should be integrated into the Chancellor's Office information system.

Second, concerns about access can't wait for the fee impact study, which is due in July of 1987. If fall 1984 enrollments (data will be available in January of 1985) show a considerable drop in access for any underrepresented group, recommended actions to alleviate this denial of access should be developed immediately.

It will not be possible to be precise, early in 1985, about how each of the following factors has affected enrollments: the tuition fee and other charges; the strengthened grading policies; the improved economy and lower level of unemployment; academic decisions, such as early start; and the decline in high school graduates, accompanied by a reduction in fees at UC and CSU. Bipartisan concern about reduced access will need to transcend a tendency to blame the enrollment loss either wholly on the new fees or wholly on other factors.

Policy recommendations on maintaining and improving access will also be important during 1985 because the Commission for Review of the Master Plan is charged with developing recommendations on this subject by the end of the year.

Third, state policies aimed at eliminating the "casual" student should be reexamined by the Board, to insure that they are necessary and properly interrelated. While there may be less concern about losing "casual" students, policymakers should be very concerned about losing "high risk" students. A student who wants to learn and has the ability, but who comes from a high risk background, may decide not to attend or to quit attending. Policymakers should be careful not to conclude that dropping out means the student was casual.

Fourth, implementation of the matriculation model is important for many reasons: it will help not only to improve student performance, but also to assure that high risk students able and willing to profit from instruction are not lost in the shuffle.

Fifth, student financial aid for the overall cost of community college education, not just the fee increment, should be considered and acted upon by the Commission to Review the Master Plan and the Joint Legislative Committee.

And, *sixth*, a critical need exists to define and revitalize student services.

C. FINANCE

1. Background and Concerns

> Community college finance policy over the past 10 years can only be characterized as chaotic. This instability is due to the fact that community colleges have experienced 8 different funding mechanisms, which contrast dramatically to the remarkable stability of community college funding over the previous quarter of a century.[44]
>
> . . .
>
> The financial condition of the California Community Colleges has been deteriorating for several years and it is now critical for many colleges... The current community college finance mechanism creates an unhealthy downward spiral in that districts are unable to make up for losses in ADA due to programmatic cutbacks forced by reductions in state funds.[45]

These two statements, emerging from Senate and Assembly reports early in 1984, intimate the nature of the finance issues that are still very real in 1985. Preparation for and transition to the next community college finance mechanism will require critical decisions about the feasibility of differential funding, the reenactment or modification of student fee provisions (which are due to sunset), and the incorporation of any relevant conclusions emerging from the mission study. Otherwise, chaos will again prevail.

The current funding mechanisms are contained in two measures, SB 851 (Chapter 568, Statutes of 1983) and AB 1XX (Chapter 1, Second Extraordinary Session, 1984).

SB 851, which sunsets on July 1, 1987:

- provides a funding base for each district based upon its prior year funding;
- provides an inflation adjustment based on the Implicit Price Deflator for State and Local Government Purchases of Goods and Services;
- provides for limited ADA growth or decline on the basis of incremental rates;
- provides equalization aid for districts with the lowest revenue limits;
- removes noncredit courses from the calculation which determines equalization; and
- requires a drop fee of $10 per course, not to exceed $20 per term, for students who drop courses after the first two weeks of the term.

While the Governor approved this finance mechanism in August of 1983, he reduced the revenues necessary to fund it by some $230 million. The Governor believed that new student fees should supply about $100 million towards this new funding mechanism, and had called upon the Legislature to enact a general fee. Attempts to reach a compromise by the end of the legislative session failed.

In late January 1984, a compromise was finally reached with the enactment of legislation to "restore the base" (AB 470 -- providing an additional $96 million for the funding mechanism) and the enactment of legislation (AB 1XX) which instituted a new fee and repealed several others. The new fee structure is scheduled to sunset on January 1, 1988. Overall, the final level of funding for 1983-84 was some $100 million short of that necessary to fully fund the provisions of SB 851.

The Board of Governors requested full funding for the SB 851 mechanism for 1984-85; however, the Governor reduced the necessary amount by some $39.3 million before signing.

Throughout the last decade of community college funding, several factors consistently emerge, and these factors have a major effect on the level and distribution of state aid:

- community college funding continues to be strongly influenced by ADA (or hours of classroom instruction) -- the only ways to increase revenues are through ADA growth and the inflation adjustment;

- since 1978 the State has, despite what the finance mechanism might require, either not funded ADA growth or has provided limited funding for capped ADA growth. On the other hand, losses in ADA, except in 1978-79, have always operated to reduce district funding;

- since 1978 the State has frequently either not funded or provided only partial funding for the inflation mechanism called for in the statutory formula;

- since 1978 both the finance mechanisms as well as the levels of funding have frequently not been known until the last minute or even into the fiscal year:

	Mechanism	Budget or Funding Bill
1978-79	SB 154 - June 24	AB 2190 - July 6
1979-80	AB 8 - July 24	SB 190 - July 13
1980-81	AB 8	AB 2020 - July 16

1981-82	AB 1626 - June 28	SB 110 - June 28; SB 840 - July 13
1982-83	AB 1626	AB 21 - June 30
1983-84	SB 851 - Aug. 1; AB 1XX - Jan. 26	SB 123 - July 21; AB 470 - Jan. 26
1984-85	SB 851; AB 1XX	AB 2313 - June 27

- o since 1978 the funding mechanism has been used to define the mission of community colleges, principally by last-minute enactments of what will or won't be funded.

Given this background, there are a number of more specific concerns that have been raised regarding community college finance:

a. *Funding Levels:* Persistent underfunding of community colleges since 1978 has weakened the community college infrastructure and jeopardized the delivery of quality programs and services.

b. *Stability and Predictability of Funding:* Community colleges can't plan or adjust because funding mechanisms and funding levels have been tremendously unstable since 1978. Community college funding mechanisms, because of their continued heavy reliance on ADA (which is difficult to predict), do not provide predictable revenues.

c. *Equity:* Past inequities in funding have been frozen in by funding mechanisms enacted since Proposition 13.

d. *Appropriateness of ADA:* Current finance mechanisms, with their heavy reliance on ADA, and during times of substantial underfunding, have created inappropriate incentives or disincentives with respect to programs and services offered by a college.

e. *Fee Policy:* Unsettled issues regarding student fees (such as the appropriate policy on instructional materials and the ADA impact of the new fee) have created further revenue uncertainty.

2. Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns

a. *Funding Levels:* Between 1978-79 and 1983-84, community colleges have lost 23% in terms of their purchasing power per ADA, and 13.2% of total apportionments as measured in constant dollars.[46] On a national scale, California's community colleges, in 1982-83, were approximately 25% below the national average of expenditures per full-time equivalent student.[47] Funding for 1984-85, while affording a healthy 11% increase in revenues per ADA, has still left colleges far behind in purchasing power per ADA.

Years of persistent underfunding have forced major cuts and readjustments at the local level, some of which include the following:[48]

- o reduction in program and course offerings;
- o reduction in staff (including 14,000 fewer faculty -- 586 fewer full-timers and 12,600 fewer part-timers -- than there were prior to Proposition 13);
- o deferral of facility maintenance;
- o deferral or elimination of capital outlay;
- o deferral or elimination of equipment acquisition, replacement or renewal;
- o deferral or elimination of staff development and renewal;
- o reduction of student services: counseling, assessment, library acquisitions;
- o reduction or elimination of institutional research;
- o reduction of planning;
- o reduction in new program development;
- o reduction in outreach efforts and off-campus centers; and
- o increasing class size (an increase from 25.6 students per instructor in 1977-78 to 32.5 students per instructor in 1982-83).

The extent to which these cuts and readjustments have jeopardized the delivery of quality education is difficult to fully assess, but the Postsecondary Education Commission has concluded, in part:

> These cuts have also resulted in thousands of students being admitted to college but not being able to enroll in the courses they need.
>
> Progress in developing programs in emerging technologies and other vocational areas has been restricted by the lack of funds for purchasing and maintaining essential equipment, and some existing high-cost vocational programs are being cut back or dropped for reasons of cost despite an insufficient supply of trained personnel in these fields.

> The ability of some colleges to provide the breadth of courses necessary to continue their transfer function, particularly in the sophomore year, is further jeopardized by budget limitations.
>
> The use of faculty attrition to reduce college expenditures has serious implications for the ability of colleges to match student interest in particular programs and courses with available faculty.
>
> The growing backlog of inadequately maintained facilities has begun to jeopardize the State's investment in these facilities.[49]

Overcoming years of substantial underfunding, particularly in the infrastructure and non-ADA producing areas which have been cut disproportionately, will be particularly difficult because of enrollment conditions existing during the 1984-85 academic year. The new tuition fee, an improved economy, new standards relating to dismissal, and other factors point to a 6 to 10% reduction in enrollments during 1984-85. Hence, at the very time when support services infrastructure needs require immediate attention, the community college funding mechanism, which is based on ADA, will be calling for a reduction in overall support.

Several steps have been taken to address the problem of persistent underfunding:

(1) *Advocacy for Adequate Funding:* While the Board consistently participates in or coordinates advocacy efforts to secure adequate funding for community colleges, efforts during the past two years merit specific attention. In January of 1984 the Board established, as part of its Basic Agenda, a theme of seeking adequate, stable, predictable and equitable funding for the community colleges:

> The Board will work with the Legislature and Governor to provide adequate, stable, predictable and equitable funding for colleges as early in the year as possible, working with the established SB 851 mechanism as much as possible. The advent of tuition must be accompanied by adequate student financial aid, and should be accompanied by a reform of existing permissive fees that are related to instructional costs... Finally, an ADA adjustment (hold harmless) must be enacted to address the serious underfunding which has occurred during the current fiscal year.

Later that month AB 1XX and AB 470 were passed, carrying out most of these objectives with respect to 1983-84 funding. Then, by June 27th, funding for 1984-85 was secured. The overall amount was some $39.3 million less than had been recommended by the Board of Governors, but nonetheless was better than funding levels for 1981-82, 1982-83, or 1983-84.

For 1985-86 the Board is recommending an 11% increase in overall funding, or an augmentation of some $135 million; which represents the computed amount necessary to fully fund the provisions of SB 851 for the year.

(2) *Infrastructure and Support Service Needs:* Since 1981, the Board has been increasingly concerned about infrastructure needs of community colleges. It sponsored successful legislation (SB 841, Chapter 764) to create a state-supported deferred maintenance program in 1981. This program has grown from $4 million in 1982-83 to $8 million in 1984-85; and the Board is seeking $12 million for 1985-86.

Also, for 1985-86 the Board will seek legislative authorization to implement a $50 million budgetary proposal for equipment replacement and renewal. Finally, some $31 million is being sought to partially implement matriculation in the community colleges.

b. *Stability and Predictability of Funding:* As previously noted, community college funding levels and mechanisms have been tremendously unstable since 1978. Also, the current funding mechanism, because of its continued reliance on ADA, does not enable districts to accurately predict revenues.

One of the reasons for instability that is community college funding levels are dependent on the condition of the State General Fund, which in turn is dependent on the overall economy. Generally speaking, as the economy declines the unemployment rate goes up and the State General Fund declines. Also, as the unemployment rate goes up community college enrollments tend to grow. Thus, when colleges face their greatest enrollment demand the State may least be able to afford it.

The condition of the General Fund is also unstable because of frequent fiscal "reforms," such as Proposition 13 (June, 1978), and income tax indexing. Also, Proposition 9 (June, 1980), and Proposition 36 (June, 1984), by their very appearance on the ballot, have created uncertainty regarding revenues.

Both the University of California and the California State University, while also dependent on the condition of the State General Fund, have greater stability of funding because of their authority to adjust fees and because they have a variety of other revenue sources.

A second reason for the instability of funding is the lack of consensus regarding the mission of community colleges. Lawmakers have varying opinions of what the State should pay for; also, many of them aren't sure what the State is currently paying for. Without a clear mission, community colleges have not fared well during times of fiscal stringency.

A number of steps have been attempted or taken to improve the stability and predictability of revenues for community colleges.

(1) *Dedication of Revenues:* There have been a number of unsuccessful proposals to fix or dedicate certain revenues for community college purposes, including a greater portion of the property tax, and a fixed portion of the sales tax.

(2) *Local Taxing Authority:* The Board, in connection with past finance plans and its 1984 Basic Agenda, supported the enactment of a limited local tax that could be levied with less than a two-thirds vote. The proposal proved not to be politically feasible, however.

(3) *Differential Funding:* In December of 1984, the Board generally endorsed a plan to implement differential funding in community colleges. This plan, which had been required by the Legislature (SB 851, Chapter 565, Statutes of 1983), and which emerged after a year-long study, proposes the establishment of three additional support categories and workload measures (student services, general services, and maintenance and operations) to go with the instructional support categories and workload measures. The new workload measures are based upon factors other than average daily attendance, and should lend greater predictability to the finance mechanism. It is also apparent that differential funding, because it more precisely measures the cost of delivering instruction and services, will serve to better account for or justify a level of funding than the current ADA mechanism does.

(4) *Mission Review:* As described previously, the formal review and definition of the community colleges' mission, to be initially completed by December 31, 1985, should contribute substantially to the stability of funding for community colleges.

c. *Equity:* Since Proposition 13, funding for community colleges has been determined primarily on the basis of prior year revenues, as adjusted for ADA growth or decline, inflation, and "equalization." This equalization adjustment is intended to make up for inequities which may have been frozen into a district's base revenues since Proposition 13. It is also intended to narrow the difference between districts in revenue per ADA. Some sort of equalization adjustment has been in

every community college finance mechanism since the original "bail out" in 1978. Inevitably, however, there have been problems with the equalization adjustment. Typically, low wealth districts believe not enough is being done, while high wealth districts believe they are being "squeezed" too much.

Steps taken to improve equity include the following:

(1) *SB 851:* The current equalization mechanism, enacted in SB 851, has operated relatively well, and would have produced even better results if the SB 851 funding formula had been fully funded.

(2) *Differential Funding:* In SB 851, however, the Legislature also expressed an intent to break away from the notion of an equalization adjustment and move to a system of differential funding. That is, districts would be provided revenues on the basis of workload generated under a variety of categories of support, a system designed to better reflect the costs of delivering instruction and services than does the current mechanism. Under differential funding the equalization adjustment would disappear, and the concept of equity would be contained in the support categories and workload measures themselves.

The differential funding plan endorsed by the Board in December of 1984 recognizes the need for a phase-in (fully operational by July 1, 1987) of its recommendations. More refined workload measures for the various support categories will need to be developed, as will a better data base. The plan also recommends that the detail of developing workload measures be delegated to the Board, along with the authority to distribute the apportionment.

d. *Appropriateness of ADA:* Community college funding mechanisms, evolving from K-12 origins, have almost always (except in SB 154 of 1978) been driven by the attendance of students in the classroom (average daily attendance, or "ADA"). The per-ADA amount is intended not only to cover the costs of classroom instruction, but also the necessary support services, administrative overhead, and facility costs. The ADA concept is an "average cost" concept, meaning that revenues generated from attendance in one class may be greater or lesser than the revenues actually needed to fund the class, its support services, administrative overhead, and facility costs. Cumulatively, revenue losing courses and revenue making courses are intended to offset one another.

In fiscally austere times the ADA concept creates an incentive to maintain or increase the number of low cost courses, as well

as a disincentive to keep high cost offerings. Thirty students in a low cost class will generate the same revenues that thirty students in a high cost class will. To adjust to already reduced funding, and to maximize current funding, there will be incentives to keep the low cost class and cut the high cost program.

The ADA concept is also inappropriate in that it, by itself, is too restrictive a workload measure. In fiscally austere times, the necessity to maintain ADA may create incentives to reduce other non-ADA producing activities such as student services or facilities maintenance.

The differential funding concept is specifically intended to establish other support categories and workload measures which reflect more accurately the costs of running a college. The plan endorsed by the Board of Governors recognizes the difficulties and potential inadvisability of establishing numerous fixed support rates for various areas of the curriculum. With respect to developing support categories and workload measures for student services, general services, and maintenance and operations, the plan is more sanguine.

e. *Fee Policy:* AB 1XX not only enacted a new mandatory fee, it also repealed ten other statutory authorizations for districts to levy certain "permissive" fees. Questions of interpretation surfaced almost immediately, particularly in two areas: 1) how and when the new $50 fee was to be charged, and whether it was refundable; and 2) what, if anything, the students could be required to procure in the way of "instructional materials." The authority to charge a fee for instructional materials had been repealed, but what did this mean about materials which students would need to have for class?

Also, there was considerable concern about the impact the new mandatory fee would have on ADA and funding levels. Questions have been raised about the wisdom of the six unit threshold and its impact on ADA.

Several developments have occurred with respect to these areas of unsettled policy on student fees.

(1) *Interpretation, Regulation and Technical Clean Up:* In March of 1984 the Chancellor's Office released a comprehensive interpretation of the new fee provisions and the effect of the repeal of various other permissive fees. A legal opinion circumscribing conditions under which students could be expected to procure their own instructional materials was also included. Later, in June, the Board adopted regulations to implement the new fee, including provisions on deferral of payment and refund.

The comprehensive interpretation also noted areas where additional technical statutory modifications were advisable. This led to AB 207 (Chapter 274), which enacted a number of such clarifications.

(2) *Instructional Materials:* AB 2808 (Chapter 1282, Statutes of 1984) provides a statement of legislative intent regarding repeal of the instructional materials fee and requests the Board to adopt regulations to clarify this policy. The intent statement provides a slightly more liberal interpretation than AB 1XX regarding materials which students might be expected to procure at their own expense.

3. Conclusions

Several conclusions emerge from this comprehensive review of concerns related to finance:

First, community colleges have been persistently and substantially underfunded since Proposition 13, forcing substantial reductions that have jeopardized the delivery of quality programs and services. Reductions in critical support and infrastructure areas such as student services, facility maintenance, equipment replacement and renewal, and program review and planning have been particularly serious, due partly to the fact that these areas are non-ADA producing. The problem of persistent and substantial underfunding is compounded for 1984-85, since it is anticipated that the advent of tuition and other factors will significantly reduce ADA in many districts.

Second, adequate funding for 1984-85 and 1985-86 should include resources to rebuild the community college infrastructure and support services, particularly in the areas of deferred maintenance, equipment renewal and replacement, matriculation, and program review and planning. Rebuilding the community college infrastructure should not be accomplished through new permanent categorical programs, but rather by programs which can be operative during the transition to differential or other long-term funding.

Third, differential funding is a concept which not only addresses the inappropriateness of ADA as a single workload measure and provides workload-driven funding for different areas of community college operations, but which also can improve the overall equity of funding among districts. Differential funding should be given full consideration and, if enacted, must be phased in. Also, the Board of Governors should be provided with authority to determine and adjust appropriate workload measures, as well as to certify the overall level of funding.

Fourth, issues related to student fees should be resolved, as much as possible, outside the legislative arena. Recognizing the controversial and preoccupying nature of student fee issues, any legislative adjustments to the student fee structure should be carefully weighed.

Fifth, and finally, enactment of the new community college funding mechanism should occur by the end of the 1986 session (September 1986), to take effect on July 1, 1987 (the sunset date of SB 851). To provide additional stability regarding funding for the new mechanism it should, if possible, address any relevant recommendations from the mission review. Also, consideration should be given to the issue of the extension of student fees, which are due to sunset on January 1, 1988.

D. GOVERNANCE

1. Background and Concerns

The community college structure of governance evolved from a K-12 statutory framework, a framework intended to be highly decentralized and responsive to the educational needs of local jurisdictions. In California, the governance structure has afforded the establishment of 70 college districts, each governed by locally elected trustees. These five or seven member boards oversee the delivery of community college education within the boundaries of their service areas, exercising authority in accordance with state and federal laws.

While community colleges were designated as a segment of higher education in the Master Plan, it was not until 1967 that a separate state board, the Board of Governors, was established for the colleges. The Board succeeded to hundreds of specific duties formerly ascribed to the State Board or State Department of Education, and was also given the following overall charge:

> It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall provide leadership and direction in the continuing development of community colleges as an integral and effective element in the structure of public higher education in the state. The work of the board shall at all times be directed to maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local autonomy and control in the administration of the community colleges.[50]

While federal laws and regulations significantly affect how community colleges are governed and administered, there are three principal arenas in which the great majority of decisions affecting community colleges are made: legislative arena, the arena of the Board of Governors, and the local district arena. It is essential to understand the nature and scope of each of these arenas in order to evaluate the community college governance structure.

The legislative arena is where most statutory and fiscal policy affecting community colleges is developed. The Legislature is the forum where statutory change proposals from the executive branch, the Legislature, the Board of Governors, community college districts, and other agencies and interest groups are considered and enacted for approval or veto by the Governor. The arena consists broadly of of 120 members; and it is supported by numerous staff, the Legislative Analyst, the Legislative Counsel, the Auditor General, and the Assembly and Senate Offices of Research. Annually, the Legislature considers some 4000 separate measures, some 175 to 250 of which affect community colleges, directly or indirectly.

Aside from the legislative and executive branches (along with their support structures), numerous agencies, organizations and interest groups propose and/or lobby for statutory changes affecting community colleges, including:

- the Board of Governors,
- the Postsecondary Education Commission,
- at least four organizations which represent the concerns of community college faculty,
- at least two organizations which represent the concerns of community college chief executive officers and administrators,
- at least six districts which have their own legislative lobbyists,
- at least one organization which represents the concerns of community college students,
- one organization which represents the concerns of community college trustees,
- one organization which represents the concerns of classified employees,
- one organization which represents the concerns of community colleges generally, and
- one organization which represents the concerns of urban districts.

Not surprisingly, the statutory policies developed in the legislative arena have proven to be extensive and highly detailed. There are over 3000 statutes in the Education Code alone which authorize, mandate, regulate, or procedurally circumscribe the activities of community college districts. This abundance of statutory policy is due not only to the fact most community college statutes are of K-12 origin (where the Legislature has always been highly involved in detail) but also to a chain of events prompted by Proposition 13: a fiscal crisis, a dramatic increase in the State's share of funding for community colleges, greater competition for resources, and the need for better accountability.

Statutory changes occurring since Proposition 13 have been enacted at a staggering rate. Since 1978, over 1650 provisions of the Education Code that affect community colleges have been added, amended or repealed. Over half of the body of state statutes affecting community colleges has thus changed within seven years.

The arena of the Board of Governors exists to carry out a variety of responsibilities and roles assigned or delegated by law.[51] While the Board, along with its administrative arm, the Chancellor's Office, is charged with carrying out some 500 particular mandates, these mandates essentially fall within two broad functions:

(1) Providing leadership and direction for the continuing development of community colleges, and representing community college districts; and

(2) Carrying out and enforcing legislative directives which fix various regulatory and compliance responsibilities for the Board.[52]

Since 1978 there has been increasing reliance on the Board to excellently perform both of these two somewhat contradictory functions. The legislative and executive branches, faced with many entities of government competing for limited resources, began to question the State's increased investment in community colleges. The Board has more frequently been turned to for answers and accountability. It has been called upon to regulate in at least 15 new areas (including course classification, the part-time instructor limit, affirmative action, auxiliary organizations, discrimination complaints, attendance accounting, deferred maintenance, fees, and financial aid) and to provide numerous reports and policy recommendations (including the credit/noncredit study, the contingency fee plan, the differential funding study and plan, the matriculation study and plan, the plan for distributing financial aid, and the fee impact study). During 1984 alone, the agency has been called upon to study and report on eight different subjects, to regulate or establish guidelines in nine different areas, to administer three new programs, and to participate in four new intersegmental activities.[53]

Since 1978 there has also been increasing reliance on the Board to perform its leadership and representation function with excellence. Local officials realize that the fate of their colleges is tied to funding and educational policy decisions made in Sacramento; and that if the Board capably represents their interests, and that if the Board is responsive to legislative and executive branch concerns, all colleges will fare better. Local officials also recognize the Board's role in mediating the varying interests of districts, as well as the varying interests of the many community college organizations. There is a growing recognition among district officials and state policymakers alike that the Board needs to play a strong role in focusing and integrating community college policymaking.

The Board has engaged in several leadership activities since 1978, including the development of a long-term finance plan, the coordination of finance coalitions, initiation of statutory and regulatory efforts to streamline and deregulate, and the creation of the Basic Agenda itself. These and other efforts are described infra.

Despite new mandatory workload arising from legislative expectations for accountability and responsiveness, and despite increased expectations about leadership which the agency has also responded to, staffing for the agency (approximately 140 positions, with a professional staff of about 90) has not increased since 1977.

The third principal decisionmaking arena, the local arena, involves the direct delivery of education. Major areas of authority and responsibility include the following:

- Establishing policies for and approving the total educational program of the district;
- Submitting programs or courses which are eligible for state support to the Board of Governors for approval;

- o Establishing policies for and approving programs and services provided by the district which are not subject to state approval;
- o Establishing academic standards for probation, dismissal, readmission and graduation (which are not inconsistent with the minimum standards adopted by the Board of Governors);
- o Determining and controlling the district's operational and capital outlay budgets, and presenting the budgets to county authorities;
- o Managing and controlling district property;
- o Establishing such student fees as are legally authorized to be established;
- o Establishing employment practices, salaries and benefits for all employees that are not inconsistent with state law or the minimum standards adopted by the Board of Governors;
- o Conducting collective bargaining for certificated and classified employees;
- o Establishing rules and regulations regarding student conduct;
- o Preparing district master plans for educational programs and facilities, and submitting such plans to the Board of Governors;
- o Determining interdistrict admission policies, entering into interdistrict attendance agreements and determining residency according to State residency law; and
- o Initiating and carrying on any activity or program which is not in conflict with, inconsistent with, or preempted by any law, and which is not in conflict with the purposes for which college districts are established.

While this list of powers and duties appears to establish near plenary authority regarding the actual delivery of educational programs and services, it must be recognized that numerous other statutes and regulations serve to establish limitations, parameters, and procedures for the exercise of these functions. For instance, districts have been given the broad authority to employ and assign all personnel, and to establish employment practices, salaries and benefits for all employees, yet there are over 500 statutory provisions which dictate such specifics as the credentials which must be held, how tenure is attained, layoff procedures, holidays, etc. And, many of these and other specifics must be collectively bargained.

During the last decade several major legal changes have operated to reduce the autonomy of community college district governing boards. Collective bargaining (1975) required college districts to meet and negotiate in good faith, rather than to simply "meet and confer." Proposition 13 (1978) ended local taxing flexibility except by two-thirds vote, thus effectively removing any discretionary revenue-raising ability. The $30 million course deletion (1982) required the termination of State aid for specific courses. The Board's strengthened minimum standards on grading policies (1980) and graduation requirements (1982) have limited district discretion in these areas. The part-time instructor limit (1981) has curtailed the hiring of part-timers. And, AB 1XX (1984) has repealed earlier authority to charge various permissive fees, while requiring districts to charge a new enrollment fee.

Local officials are pointing to other developments in Sacramento which they believe will further erode local autonomy, including: the establishment of priorities within the mission, differential funding, matriculation, new academic rigor standards, and the possibility of a remedial floor.

Given this background, there is a list of specific concerns that have been raised regarding community college governance:

a. *The Legislative Arena:* There is a concern that the legislative arena is producing too much multi-directional policy change, and that it is legislating specifics that should be addressed by either the Board of Governors or local districts. A related concern is that the legislative arena is a very political one, sometimes causing community college policymaking to become caught in the fray.[54]

b. *The Arena of the Board of Governors:* There is a concern that the Board of Governors is neither doing enough to provide accountability and responsiveness to legislative and executive branch concerns; nor enough to promote the continuing development of community colleges by providing leadership, direction, representation and service to community college districts. There is a concern that state agency functions are not being administered effectively, efficiently and consistently. There is also a concern, however, that the agency does not have the resources to do all that is required or expected of it.

c. *The Local Arena:* There is a concern that community college districts are losing their authority to govern, and that many policies which should be left to local districts are being decided within the arenas of the Legislature and the Board of Governors. A related concern is that district decision-making is not being respected or held in high regard.

2. Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns

a. *The Legislative Arena:* Community college policymaking within the legislative arena has been rapid, often-unpredictable and diffuse, especially since the passage of Proposition 13. As previously mentioned, since 1978, over 1650 changes (statutes added, amended or repealed) have been enacted in the Education Code alone. During this six-year period, community colleges have had to cope, for instance, with five different finance mechanisms, a $30 million reduction in recreational and avocational courses, a host of policies on the funding of noncredit offerings, permissive fee reform and tuition.

When the statutes enacted by the Legislature are analyzed, it is also clear that many of them are short-term and issue-specific. There are conflicts as well as redundancies in these policies, demonstrating that there has been insufficient analysis of how they interact with one another. For instance, during 1983 there were three bills enacted which addressed equalization of funding (SB 851, AB 1656 and AB 1524). The only way to harmonize these measures is to discount AB 1524 and AB 1656 as statements of legislative intent.

Also, the multi-directional nature of these policies suggests not only a tendency to be more concerned with solutions than with problem indentification and analysis, but also a tendency to deal more with narrow concerns than "big picture" problems. All too often bills pass on the basis of anecdotal evidence related to one or two districts; and all too often policy is adopted to address one interest group's view of a problem, rather than placing the organization's concern in a broader context.[55]

Finally, an analysis of the policies indicates that there may be insufficient thought given to selecting the appropriate governance arena in which to develop the policy change. Each year the Legislature considers and enacts numerous proposals which more appropriately should be dealt with by the Board of Governors, or by districts themselves. For instance, policies related to the content of social science courses (Education Code Section 78202), the maintenance of weekend classes (Section 79028) or the observance of Conservation Day (Section 79025) need not be legislatively determined. Clearly, the Legislature may properly intervene when districts or the Board fail to address problems they should be addressing. But neither the Legislature, the Board of Governors, nor local districts can respond to all problems simultaneously. Again, there is a need for both the Legislature and the Board to be more clear and focused in expressing expectations for district and Board response.

Two efforts have been undertaken to address overreliance on the legislative arena and bring more focus to policies which are considered within it.

(1) *Coalition Approach:* The "coalition" approach has gained popularity as a strategy to direct attention to critical issues and to provide the opportunity for community colleges to speak with one voice. This approach can be and has been effective. The coalition approach was essential to the passage of the community college finance bill, SB 851. It also has served the community colleges well in recent activities regarding vocational education.

In spite of its success, the coalition approach has inherent limitations. Coalitions are issue-specific and have no official status; consequently, they need to be recreated and re-negotiated frequently. The biggest drawback, however, is that coalitions all too often take a "lowest common denominator" approach in order to accommodate the views of all into the recommended policy. Coalitions often tend to avoid hard issues and tough decisions, leaving policymakers frustrated with the lack of movement on such concerns. The situation is then ripe for action by the Legislature and other State agencies willing to confront the hard issues for the community colleges.

(2) *The Basic Agenda:* Starting in 1984, the Board embarked on developing a method for improving the quality, consistency and manageability of community college policy. It instituted the "Basic Agenda" which, through a specifically designed process, will annually:

- Focus legislative and executive branch, Board and district attention on "big picture" problems facing community colleges;
- Place more emphasis on problem identification, documentation and analysis before recommending solutions; and,
- Emphasize a sense of discipline in selecting the appropriate governance arena and mechanisms for solution.

The Basic Agenda recognizes that not all concerns regarding community colleges can be addressed simultaneously, and that solutions to problems being addressed need to be interrelated and logically sequenced.

b. *The Arena of the Board of Governors:* Sharply increased reliance upon and expectations for the agency to provide both increased accountability and leadership have been difficult to accommodate with steady state resources. Mandatory new workload to fulfill regulatory, oversight and program administration responsibilities, as well as new workload to meet the responsibilities to provide leadership, direction and representation, have had to be absorbed within existing staff. The ostensible conflict between being a regulator and being a leader has also been difficult to deal with. When the agency

has moved to meet an accountability concern, it is perceived by some as abrogating its leadership or advocacy responsibilities. On the other hand, when the agency moves to provide leadership and support, it is perceived by some as protecting the colleges and thwarting efforts to achieve better accountability.

Despite resource limitations, and despite the ostensible conflict between leadership and accountability, the Board has taken several steps to improve these functions within recent years. Overall, the strategy has been to initiate projects which serve the ends of both accountability and leadership, and to look for efficiencies whenever possible.

(1) *Streamlining Statutes and Regulations:* The Board has undertaken at least three major efforts to streamline and update not only its own responsibilities, but also the responsibilities of districts. In 1979 the Board sponsored successful legislation (AB 1549) which repealed or amended some 150 statutes which prescribed unnecessary or outmoded duties for the Board of Governors. This legislation was the first step in identifying and limiting the number of mandates the agency had to respond to, given its limited resources.

In 1981 and 1982 the Board of Governors sponsored a three bill package (AB 1726, 1729, 1730) to steamline community college governance and administration. Together this successful package of bills repealed some 500 unnecessary or outdated provisions, and amended an additional 250. Unnecessary K-12 vestiges were removed, and the Legislature's earlier action to establish a "permissive code" was implemented. Also in 1982 the Board sponsored a successful bill (AB 3025), which simplified the law on community college district organization and reorganization.

In late 1981, after securing passage of legislation to streamline community college governance and administration, the Board began a year-long effort to deregulate. This effort was taken in conjunction with the recently enacted requirement for all agencies to review their regulations. As a result of this comprehensive review, the Board reduced the total number of its regulations from 760 to 615, a 20% reduction.

(2) *Community College Finance*: Starting in 1978, with the passage of Proposition 13, the Chancellor's Office has played an active role in helping achieve consensus regarding finance issues. The Board undertook a study of finance and developed the Long-Term Finance Plan, which has shaped many of the finance mechanisms adopted since Proposition 13. Also, key portions of SB 154, AB 8, AB 1626 and SB 851 were developed and drafted by staff after extensive consultation with districts, organizational groups and legislative staff.

(3) *Accountability Reforms:* The Board has undertaken and is undertaking major reforms in the areas of planning, compliance, and program review. These reforms include attendance accounting standards and compliance auditing, minimum standards, comprehensive planning, a project to improve evaluation, and better accounting procedures. Reforms for the future include a comprehensive review and interrelation of compliance mechanisms administered by the agency.

In 1982 the Board of Governors adopted major regulations which established, clarified and consolidated standards and procedures by which community college districts claim average daily attendance to receive state support. These standards and procedures, adopted after eight months of study and deliberation, help assure that state support is distributed according to the same rules in all districts.

A second aspect of this effort to improve fiscal accountability was the development of audit resolution procedures for contracted, independent audits which are annually required for community colleges. These procedures more specifically addressed the role of the Chancellor's Office with respect to audit citings raised at the local level. Since implementation of this resolution process, the Chancellor's Office has recovered and redistributed over $1.3 million in misappropriated funds and taken other corrective actions affecting more than half of the districts.

In March of 1983 the Board adopted a major revision of its regulations fixing "minimum standards" for the receipt of state aid. During the previous 15 months the Board had been engaged in a comprehensive review of its then existing 60 minimum standards. The primary purpose of this effort was to focus effort on critical compliance concerns that the Board was not otherwise monitoring, and to ensure that all minimum standards were objectively verifiable and established reasonable base levels of performance. The Board's effort was successful in that it reduced the number of minimum standards from 60 to 14, while at the same time identifying such critical areas of concern as grading policies, graduation requirements, affirmative action requirements, counseling requirements, and student fees. The new regulations also, for the first time, established a procedure for monitoring and enforcing the new standards.

In what has come to be called the "comprehensive planning project," the Board of Governors is taking steps to consolidate various heretofore separate planning processes into a single planning document. A key element of the new process will involve district planning and evaluation around "statewide priorities" which are identified by the Board of Governors. Planning for educational programs,

facilities, student services, staffing (affirmative action), categorical programs, and other matters will be done in conjunction with a single process and document, with the State's interest in these areas being reflected by statewide priorities which districts will respond to in their planning deliberations. Currently this comprehensive planning process is being field tested in selected districts, with more complete implementation scheduled for the 1986-87 fiscal year. Resources for this undertaking are being sought for the 1985-86 fiscal year.

In 1981 the Chancellor's Office and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges applied for and received federal funding from the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to jointly pursue a project related to planning and evaluation in the community colleges. The basic thrust of the project is to analyze the current respective planning and evaluation responsibilities of the Board of Governors and the Accrediting Commission, and to more clearly and effectively delineate the appropriate roles of state agency evaluation and the accreditation process. One major aim is to eliminate duplication of effort between the two processes. Another important outcome of this project will be to strengthen the accreditation process and thereby improve its use as an accountability mechanism.

In October of 1983 the Board of Governors adopted a comprehensive revision of its Community Colleges Budget and Accounting Manual, which culminated a four-year effort in this area. Late in 1979 the agency contracted with Arthur Young & Co. to study community college accounting practices and recommend necessary changes in the budget and accounting procedures followed by colleges. The study found significant disparities in the way districts accounted for various funds and transactions. The new manual will establish a higher degree of uniformity and consistency in district accounting practices. Significantly, one part of the effort was to remove various budgeting and accounting procedures from the Education Code and turn them over to the Board of Governors. Legislation to accomplish this purpose (AB 1217) was passed in 1981.

Additional work on accountability reforms in the area of compliance mechanisms is scheduled for mid to late 1985. This project entails a comprehensive review of the compliance mechanisms administered by the agency, including how they interrelate with one another, and where they leave gaps in compliance monitoring. The work will eliminate duplication in monitoring mechanisms, thus relieving districts of unnecessary audits, compliance visits or certifications. The work will also improve existing mechanisms and ensure coverage of previously unmonitored areas which need to be monitored.

(4) *Governance Project -- Delineation of Functions:* Late in 1983 the Board of Governors, working in conjunction with the statewide trustees organization (California Community College Trustees) created a joint commission of Board and Trustee members to explore and develop methods of establishing mutual understanding between the state and local boards; and to review and redelineate, as necessary, the roles and responsibilities of the state board and of local boards. This Commission is expected to complete its work by mid to late 1985. Its product will probably lead to regulation changes and possible recommendations for legislation.

(5) *Communication:* In 1984, the Board adopted a priority to upgrade and augment its communication functions. The Board recognized that communication is essential for both accountability and leadership purposes. Local officials need to know the statutes, regulations and policies they are expected to adhere to. They also need to know about activities of the Board or Legislature to develop new policy. Likewise, state officials need to know what the Board and districts are doing or have done to address concerns they may have. Communication is an essential element in making accountability and leadership initiatives work.

Efforts to upgrade and augment communications include improving the quality and consistency of the agenda, instituting a regular newsletter, networking with district public information officers, and improving responsiveness to the media.

(6) *Management Study:* In October of 1984 the Board retained Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. to study the organization and management of the Chancellor's Office, along with a feasibility study of an automated office system to support its mission. The study will among other things: review the office's legally mandated functions; identify internal and external expectations of what the office's responsibilities are and evaluate their relationship to the mandates; examine existing organizational structures and decisionmaking processes to determine compatability with mandated functions and growing leadership responsibilities; evaluate whether the office has the resources necessary to carry out mandated functions and internal and external expectations; and make recommendations regarding funding, staffing, management information, organization, and processes for management. The study is to be completed by mid-March of 1985.

(7) *Basic Agenda:* The development of a Basic Agenda is both an accountability and a leadership effort. It identifies and assesses problems facing community colleges, and summarizes what has been and is being done to address

these concerns. The Basic Agenda, at the start of the year, will identify legislation which should be adopted, regulations which should be developed, and studies which should be undertaken during the course of the year. In this, it provides leadership and direction on the critical matters of community college policy.

(8) *1985-86 Budget*: To address the resource needs for providing improved leadership and accountability, the Board has requested significant additional resources in its 1985-86 proposed budget.[56] Accountability improvements have been sought through staff to oversee comprehensive planning, provide additional evaluation and analysis, and develop Phase II of the statewide Information System. Leadership improvements have been sought through proposing a new fund to provide agency responsiveness and adaptibility; and seeking additonal staff for communications, Basic Agenda development and Executive Unit and Board coordination. The proposal to improve agency responsiveness and adaptability is unique in that it would not create additional permanent staff positions, but rather enable the agency to respond to rapidly changing accountability and leadership needs without having to wait for a subsequent budget cycle.

c. *The Local Arena*: As previously discussed, the autonomy of local boards has been reduced during the last decade. With the predominant share of funding being furnished by the State, advocacy groups for community college constituencies have naturally gravitated to Sacramento to protect or secure their interests. Also, with reduced resources at the local level there has been increased competition, as well as an increased number of programs, groups or individuals whose needs are not met. Frustration with the local resolution of matters has driven some groups and individuals to Sacramento to seek relief. Laws such as the part-time instructor limit (Education Code Section 87613) and the health services maintenance of effort requirement (Education Code Section 72246.5) are examples of matters which should be addressed by local districts, but which the Legislature apparently perceived were not being addressed fairly.

Some important steps are being taken to assure that local governing boards retain their authority to govern, as well as to assure that the Board of Governors and Legislature defer to local decisionmaking where appropriate.

(1) *Governance Project -- Delineation of Functions:* As previously described, this joint effort between the Board of Governors and the statewide trustee organization should promote better understanding of the respective roles of the State and local boards. For example, when the law assigns a specified responsibility to local districts, and

the Board of Governors has no clear documentation that districts are ignoring or abusing this responsibility, the Board should not intervene with its own statewide policy, but should defer to the local governing boards.

(2) *Trustee Information and Involvement:* The statewide trustee association has recently embarked on a major effort to provide in-service training and education for trustees. Rapidly occurring shifts in law and policy have made it almost impossible for a trustee to stay up to date on new responsibilities.

(3) *Basic Agenda:* The Basic Agenda process, by specifically focusing on problem documentation, and by specifically focusing on the appropriate governance arena to address the problem, should bring about a greater sense of discipline in deciding which problems are to be addressed in which arenas.

(4) *Local Efforts:* Many districts have undertaken extensive efforts to improve the processes and quality of local decisionmaking. These improvements can reduce the tendency for disenchanted constituencies to seek relief in Sacramento, and, rather, abide by the local decision.

3. Conclusions

Several conclusions emerge from this comprehensive discussion of concerns related to governance:

First, policymaking for community colleges in the legislative arena has been rapid, multi-directional, and undisciplined, especially since Proposition 13. One major effect of these rapidly changing and unpredictable laws has been to create major uncertainty, instability and consternation in the colleges. Without a doubt these factors have jeopardized the delivery of quality programs and services.

Second, increasingly since Proposition 13, the Legislature has decided piecemeal many community college educational policies which should more properly be decided by the Board of Governors or local districts. The long-term public interest requires that the Board of Governors be given the authority as well as the responsibility for statewide community college educational policy, and that, in so doing, the Board should preserve and protect local control and initiative.

Third, the Basic Agenda can play an important part in bringing about more stability, focus and discipline in community college policymaking. The process allows for all those who make or participate in making community college policy to share their concerns. The process also focuses on documenting and interrelating the various concerns, as well as what has been done to address them. Finally, with

respect to solutions, the process calls for greater discipline in selecting the appropriate arena.

Fourth, as a part of the review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, it may be appropriate to look again at the body of law pertaining to community colleges. The fact that such detailed and particular statutes are in the Education Code in the first place (carried over from K-12 origins) has enormous implications in that all changes to such statutes must be brought back to the legislative arena.

Fifth, the legitimacy and necessity for both leadership and accountability, the two overall functions of the Board of Governors, must be recognized by state officials and local educators alike. Leadership or advocacy for the community colleges will not be credible unless the Board can demonstrate accountability for the actions of districts. On the other hand, chaotic overregulation and great uncertainty will result if the agency simply responds to the accountability concerns and expectations of others. Accountability and leadership are both necessary, and State and local officials need to recognize and support both functions.

In reality, the Chancellor's Office is an agency with severely limited resources attempting to respond to extensive mandatory responsibilities and differing expectations of state and local officials. The management study of the office should help to identify efficiencies, organizational improvements, outdated functions and overall staffing needs. It should help the agency become more effective and efficient. More important, however, is the Basic Agenda. This document, after opportunity for input from state and local officials, will indicate how the agency intends to use its limited resources to address particular concerns through leadership and accountability efforts.

Sixth, there is cause for concern about the abrogation of local decision-making powers. As noted in Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era:

> Fewer and fewer important decisions are being made by the campus administrator. Part of the problem is that community college leaders have not successfully distinguished between decisions educators should be making and those that rightfully should be made by legislators and external agencies. A challenge to community college leadership is to articulate its role in such a manner as to delineate lines of authority clearly. As encroachment on the campus decision-making process occurs, leaders must be prepared to fight. To abrogate willingly the right to make educational decisions is to trust institutional integrity to forces outside the community college campus.[57]

The joint governance project is a critical effort to delineate lines of responsibility between the Board of Governors and local boards, and to promote greater sensitivity in respecting those lines.

Finally, since Proposition 13, increased competition for students and resources has occurred -- within districts (such as collective bargaining disputes); among districts (such as interdistrict attendance disputes); among statewide interest groups (such as disputes over the 50% law or the part-time instructor limit); and among segments of education (such as disputes over admission and transfer policies). The three governance arenas need to insure fair processes for resolving conflicts arising from that competition. The autonomy of each of the arenas of decisionmaking should be respected in the decisions it is required to make, and these decisions should not be circumvented or overruled on the basis of anecdotal evidence or hypothetical concerns.

To this end, it is timely to address an improvement and strengthening of all three governance arenas, with each arena considering ways to improve its own decision-making processes, and with representatives from all arenas working together to establish a clearer delineation of responsibilities.

E. EMPLOYEES

1. Background and Concerns

Historically, laws affecting the employment of community college personnel have been similar to those pertaining to K-12 districts. The district selects its employees, but is subject to numerous and extensive statutory controls in such areas as credential requirements, tenure, layoff, dismissal, and affirmative action. All together, there are over 500 provisions in the Education Code which relate to community college employees (not counting an additional 400 provisions which relate to retirement).

Since 1976, collective bargaining has been available for community college districts, giving employees the right to negotiate wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment (including class size, evaluation procedures, and layoff).

Prior to the enactment of collective bargaining, the Legislature had taken a relatively activist approach toward school and community college district employment law. Many of the reforms enacted during these earlier years were aimed at protecting the rights of employees, who then only had the right to "meet and confer" with management.

While there are extensive statutory provisions related to community college employees, the responsibilities of the Board of Governors are relatively separate and isolated:

- Credentialing: Instructors, supervisors, administrators, librarians, counselors and student personnel workers must have a credential as a condition of employment. The Board of Governors took over credentialing functions when it was created in 1967. Most credentialing standards are fixed in statutes, which the Board has interpreted through regulations.

- Affirmative action: The Board is required to assist colleges in adopting and maintaining affirmative action programs.

- Discrimination complaints: The Board is required by law to investigate complaints of discrimination raised by community college employees.

- "50% Law:" The Board is required to enforce Education Code Section 84362, which requires districts to expend at least 50% of their current expense of education on the salaries of classroom instructors;

- Part-time instructors: The Board is required to review plans of districts which fail to comply with a provision of law which limits their use of part-time instructors.

- o Data collection: The Chancellor's Office annually collects data on community college employees, including category of employment, age, sex, ethnicity, full or part-time status, workload, and salary.

By 1982, the Board became concerned that its focus on separate and isolated employment concerns was leaving the general subject of employment relatively unattended from the State perspective. Of particular concern were issues regarding the quality of instructional staff and employees generally -- whether State laws and policies were sufficiently aimed at promoting excellent instruction and support services. Proposals to consolidate and augment existing resources into a new employment practices unit that could also attend to these quality issues were denied in the 1983-84 and 1984-85 budgetary processes. Despite these denials, the Board, in connection with its 1984 Basic Agenda, initiated an inquiry into employee quality concerns. Working with district and organizational group representatives, staff pursued a study of several critical employment issues.[58] Constraints in staffing slowed progress on the study, but important information and analysis is still being developed.

Throughout the years, and especially since Proposition 13, there have been a number of community college employment concerns which have consistently been raised:

a. *Attrition in Full-Time Instructors:* A concern has been raised that full-time instructors, as they are dismissed, quit or retire, are not being replaced by full-time instructors. Instead, it is contended that districts are replacing full-timers with part-time instructors.

b. *Part-Time Instructors:* Concerns often raised are that there are too many part-time instructors teaching in community colleges; and that many of these instructors aren't accessible to students, aren't evaluated, and don't participate in curriculum development. Counter arguments are that part-time instructors are necessary for program flexibility and currency; and that part-timers are accessible to students and are evaluated.

c. *Tenure:* There is a belief that the probationary period for achieving tenure is too short; and that tenure laws in general have inhibited program flexibility.

d. *Affirmative Action*: There is a concern that the philosophy and goals of affirmative action are not being earnestly pursued, and that recent gains will be lost during periods of retrenchment.

e. *Currency of Instructors:* The perception has become more prevalent within recent years that instructors are not staying up-to-date in their fields. Reasons cited for this perception include lifetime credentialing, the lack of continuing education requirements, and the lack of staff development and in-service training.

f. *Salaries:* Differing viewpoints have been expressed that salaries are both too low and too high; and concerns have been raised about the significant salary disparities among districts.

g. *Aging Workforce and Morale:* Concerns have been raised about the increasing percentage of community college employees, especially faculty, who are older or reaching retirement age. These concerns center around avoiding burnout, promoting renewal, and preventing an overall loss of internal dynamism for the college.

2. Past and Current Efforts to Address Concerns:

a. *Attrition in Full-Time Instructors*: When put in the perspective of staff reductions generally, the concern about declining numbers of full-time instructors appears unwarranted.

Year	Total Faculty	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	Total Non Faculty
1977-78	51,621	16,176	35,445 (est)	N/A
1978-79	43,150	15,917	27,233	N/A
1979-80	44,088	16,260	27,828	N/A
1980-81	45,632	15,753	29,879	N/A
1981-82	46,829	16,412	30,417	22,974 (est.)
1982-83	41,739	16,419	25,319	22,870
1983-84	39,082	16,235	22,847	21,274

Source: Chancellor's Office Information System

The data indicate that the number of full-time instructors has generally remained between 16,000-16,500, while the number of part-timers has steadily declined -- falling off by more than 7500 employees since 1981-82. Limited data available on the numbers of non-faculty employees indicate a reduction of more than 1600 employees since 1982-83.

b. *Part-Time Instructors:* Part-time instructors, who may be laid off at any time, provide colleges with flexibility in adjusting to funding fluctuations, as well as flexibility in program selection. Part-time instructors frequently provide specialized expertise that may not be available with full-time faculty. But because part-time instructors are generally less expensive than full-time faculty, concerns have been raised that their use could increase without limit, leading to the erosion of educational quality.

The Legislature acted upon such concerns in 1981 when it established a limit on the use of part-time instructors (AB 1626, Chapter 103). This limit was extended in 1983 (SB 851, Chapter 565). It generally prohibits districts from exceeding their three year average of weekly faculty contact hours taught by part-time instructors during 1980-81, 1981-82 and 1982-83.

As displayed in the table above, there were nearly 12,600 fewer part-timers in 1983-84 than there were in 1977-78. Also, since the first year of the part-time instructor limit (1981-82) there are nearly 7600 fewer part-timers. Years when enrollments are up (1977-78, 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82) are accompanied by increases in part-timers, while years with substantial funding cuts (1978-79, 1982-83) show dramatic decreases in the number of part-timers.

Even though part-time instructors currently comprise about 58% of all community college instructors (the national average for community colleges in 1980 was 51%), they teach only about 30% of all class hours. Part-time instructors teach an average of 5.2 contact hours per week, while full-time instructors teach an average of 16.2 hours.

While both the number and percentage of hours taught by part-time instructors have declined during recent years, there remains the concern of whether there are still too many such instructors. The issue has been described in terms of the need for a "critical mass" of full-time faculty to ensure program integrity. The concern is based on the assumption that part-time faculty do not participate in student counseling, curriculum development, or institutional governance, and seldom hold office hours or establish times for assisting individual students. The lack of these activities is believed to lead to the exploitation of the full-time faculty and, more important, to poor quality education for the student.[59]

Concerns about "educational quality" and "critical mass" hinge on the assumptions noted above. The last statewide data gathered on these assumptions was in 1981, in connection with a special report on faculty employment required by AB 1550 (Chapter 1177, Statutes of 1980).[60] While the assumption was borne out by data in that report, it is not known how conditions have changed since.

c. *Tenure:* Certificated employees are employed in permanent positions as contract or regular employees. The employee serves two years as a contract employee, then, if retained for a third year, becomes a regular, or tenured, employee.

A first-year contract employee is entitled to a preliminary notice not later than March 15 (and final notice not later than May 15) if his or her services will not be required for the following year. A second-year contract employee is also entitled to a preliminary notice by March 15 (and a final notice by May 15) if he or she will not be rehired and may request a hearing to contest the district's decision. A regular employee may be dismissed only for one of the causes listed in Education Code Section 87732.

All contract and regular certificated employees other than the superintendent, deputy or assistant superintendent, and the college president, must be evaluated. Contract employees must be evaluated every year. Regular employees must be evaluated every other year.

Neither a contract nor a regular employee may be dismissed unless the employee has been evaluated and the governing board has received and considered the statements of evaluation and recommendations from the superintendent and/or president.

District administrators have contended that the two year probationary period is too short to determine whether an employee should be permanent. They have also pointed to the predicament created by the March 15 deadline for notice. In mid March it is usually impossible to determine district funding levels, since these levels won't be known until after the State Budget is signed (usually in July). If notice isn't given the employee can't be laid off; on the other hand if notice is given "just in case," there are substantial morale complications as well as the expense of hearings.

d. *Affirmative Action:* In 1977 the Board of Governors, in response to studies of community college employment patterns, and in response to federal laws and court cases, adopted regulations requiring districts to develop affirmative action plans and policies. Some officials challenged the authority of the Board to adopt such regulations, but the Legislature specifically recognized the Board's authority to adopt these regulations in SB 1620 (Chapter 766) of 1978.

During 1981 the Board undertook a further study of its policies, and in December of that year adopted additional regulations to ensure that State and federal affirmative action concerns were being carried out. Certain of these regulations were designated as "minimum standards" for receipt of state aid, to insure that they would be carried out.

In early 1982, the Board initiated another project to assure progress in affirmative action by creating a task force to develop methods of bringing greater uniformity and sophistication in the use of labor market and demographic data to establish employment targets for affirmative action purposes. In October of 1983, this task force issued its recommendations, finding that employment targets should be established by assigning certain specified weights to the percentages of the particular racial or ethnic group in: 1) the general population of the State, 2) the total labor force, 3) the pool of persons with the requisite skills, and 4) the pool of persons with requisite academic training. These four factors and assigned weightings are now being applied by districts as they revise their affirmative action goals and timetables each three years. The results should be greater uniformity in the way

employment targets are established, and an improvement in the ability of the State to monitor the relative progress of the various districts.[61]

e. *Currency of Instructors:* There is a dearth of research or data on the nexus between continuing education requirements and the maintenance of professional competency. There is no known research which documents that community college instructors are not up-to-date in their fields. It is probable, however, that reductions in staff development and sabbaticals during recent years have had an impact.

In 1984, the "Community College Vocational Education and Technology Instructor and Counselor In Service Training Program" was signed into law (AB 3938, Chapter 1662). This program, which was called for in the Board's position statement on vocational education, and which will be administered by the Chancellor, will help ensure subject matter currency in areas of the curriculum which are changing rapidly.

f. *Salaries:* In The Neglected Branch, the Senate Office of Research found:

> California appears to compare favorably with the rest of the country in community college faculty salary levels. According to the data published by the National Education Association, (NEA), California ranked second highest in average salaries of faculty at public 2-year colleges in 1980-81. The NEA data also shows that California salaries were 29% above the national average. The next highest state, Michigan, was only 7.6% above the national average.[62]

On the other hand the buying-power (in constant, price-adjusted, dollars) of today's salary has dropped by one-fifth over the period (see below) of 1973 to 1983. The buying power of today's full-time faculty salary is higher than that paid two or three decades ago, however.

Year	Full-Time Salary Current Dollars	Full-time Salary Constant Dollars
1953	$ 5,886	$ 23,589
1963	9,353	31,868
1973	17,700	40,179
1974	19,222	39,174
1977	22,413	37,071
1978	24,123	36,595
1981	30,156	32,176
1983	32,704	32,704

With respect to salary disparities among districts, the following table depicts the top and bottom ten of the 70 districts:

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty	Mean Salary 1983-84
Ten Highest Paying Districts		
Sequoias	135	$ 38,750
Saddleback	237	37,697
El Camino	390	37,110
West Kern	25	36,786
San Joaquin Delta	235	35,579
San Jose	239	35,053
Mount San Antonio	270	34,942
Cerritos	224	34,900
Mira Costa	87	34,549
Rio Hondo	190	34,406
Statewide Average	16,235	$ 32,704
Ten Lowest Paying Districts		
Gavilan	63	$ 29,230
Peralta	609	29,213
Antelope Valley	84	29,185
Lassen	27	29,098
Compton	78	29,091
Cabrillo	176	28,631
Lake Tahoe	18	28,429
Allan Hancock	144	28,401
Siskiyou	46	28,326
Napa	98	28,245

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission Staff Analysis.

Applying this data, it should be noted that 53 districts (or 75%) are between $29,230 and $34,406, a range of only $5,000. Also, this data does not take into account that some districts may have a greater than average proportion of full-time instructors who have been with the district for many years and are, therefore, at the upper end of the salary schedule.

g. *Aging Workforce and Morale:* The following table depicts the current age distribution of community college employees:

Age	Distribution of Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	Certificated Administrators	Classified
Less than 30	.02	.10	.00	.18
30 to 39	.25	.39	.19	.30
40 to 49	.35	.29	.39	.23
50 to 59	.30	.16	.36	.23
60 and over	.08	.06	.06	.06

More than one-third of the full-time faculty are over fifty years-of-age. As might be expected, part-time faculty are younger and certificated administrators are somewhat older than are the full-time faculty.

Additional data indicate that in 1984, 21% of full-time faculty were eligible for retirement, and 17% more were between ages 50 and 54. Among managers, 20% were eligible for retirement, and another 22% between the ages of 50 and 54.

Along with age has come the concern about staff disenchantment:

> "Staff discontent, disillusionment, burn-out, hostility and conflict have become facts of community college life. They result, in part, from fiscal stringency, dismissals, conflicts over priorities, centralization of authority, and shift of power to agencies off campus."[63]

National authorities on community colleges have also noted this problem:

> There is evicence to suggest that community college faculty are becoming alienated from administration, from institutional goals, and from one another. The distrust inherent in the differing roles of faculty and administrators has been further aggravated by the rapid growth in size and complexity of institutions with its subsequent attenuation of communication.[64]

Two initial steps have been taken to address concerns about aging staff and disillusionment.

(1) *Early Retirement:* A bill allowing for early retirement (AB 2223, Chapter 361) was enacted in 1984. This measure will give those who want to retire early, for any reason, an opportunity to do so.

(2) *Future Study:* The Board's project on future study will specifically focus on the aging staff and staff burnout trends. By late spring of 1985 it is expected that policy recommendations for dealing with this concern will be developed.

3. Conclusions

Several conclusions emerge from this comprehensive discussion of concerns related to employees:

First, there is a need for more attention and energy to be given to resolving concerns about the quality of instructional and other staff, as well as concerns about whether the existing structure of employment laws and policies promotes excellent instruction and support services. There is, in particular, a need for additional data gathering and analysis to be directed at resolving many of the concerns regarding community college employees. For instance, the concept of a "critical mass" of full-time instructors has initial appeal, but thoughtful analysis will need to precede the fixing of any percentage or limit. It will also be important to know the extent to which part-timers currently hold office hours, participate in curriculum development, and possess the same kinds of credentials as other instructors.

Second, most of the concerns discussed do not appear to require immediate legislative or regulatory action. For instance, the sharp decline in the number of part-time instructors and the institution of the part-time instructor limit are factors which should allow the concept of "critical mass" to be considered more thoroughly. Salary levels and the average age of employees probably won't change unexpectedly in two or three years. Other more pressing and immediate issues will require action during 1985, and should be dealt with first.

Third, the Board should continue its inquiry into employment concerns initiated in 1984. This inquiry should lead to analysis and recommended activities, both short-term and long-term, upon which new public policy may be based. Particular areas of focus should include the impact of tenure laws, the issue of critical mass, attrition in full-time faculty, affirmative action, strengthening of credential standards, and the effects of collective bargaining.

Finally, the need for staff renewal and revitalization is immediate. Additional resources will most probably be needed to address this concern, and the Board should afford this concern a high priority as it completes its work on future study and develops its proposals for the funding of colleges in 1986-87.

II. PART TWO: MAJOR CONCLUSIONS AND POLICYMAKING RESPONSES

A. IMPROVING THE POLICYMAKING PROCESS

B. SETTING THE 1985 BASIC AGENDA

A. IMPROVING THE POLICYMAKING PROCESS

PART TWO: MAJOR CONCLUSIONS AND POLICYMAKING RESPONSES

Part One of this document identifies some 33 problem areas concerning community colleges that policymakers have raised since the passage of Proposition 13. It then proceeds to describe over 65 policy actions which have already been undertaken to solve the problems. This comprehensive review leads to three essential conclusions:

1. First, it is abundantly clear that community colleges have been reformed, and have reformed themselves, in many ways since Proposition 13. Strengthened standards for grading, probation, dismissal and graduation have all been implemented. State support for recreational offerings has been eliminated, and new structure of student fees has been enacted. These reforms are especially remarkable considering that they have come during an era of significantly reduced funding.

2. Second, renewal and reform must continue, and to this end there are several substantive public policy decisions and policymaking activities which require priority attention during 1985.

3. Third, *who* is shaping these reforms and *how* they are being developed are process reforms as important as the substantive reforms themselves. Increasingly since Proposition 13, the Legislature has decided piecemeal many community college educational policies which should more properly be decided by the Board of Governors or local districts. The long-term public interest requires that the Board of Governors be given the authority as well as the responsibility for statewide community college educational policy, and that, in so doing, the Board should preserve and protect local control and initiative. The long-term public interest also requires that future policymaking be supported by adequate data and analysis as well as established processes for participation and consultation.

To this end, as a prelude to its substantive conclusions and recommendations for the 1985 Basic Agenda, the Board offers its recommendations for improving the community college policymaking process.

A. IMPROVING THE POLICYMAKING PROCESS

A number of deficiencies in the current community college policymaking process become apparent with an analysis of how the various policy solutions described in Part One were developed:

Policymaking has not been regularly supported with adequate data and analysis. With respect to many of the problems raised in Part One of this document, perception and opinion, as opposed to documentation and analysis, has sufficed as the basis for state-level responses. The lack of data and analysis has exacerbated tendencies to rely on anecdotal evidence. Also, incorrect or outdated perceptions about problems have been difficult to refute without current and reliable data.

IMPROVING THE POLICYMAKING PROCESS

The major data collection and analysis systems for community colleges were designed during an era of predominantly local funding and have evolved piecemeal since. Most data provision by districts is voluntary, with no direct reimbursement for this effort. In the past, even these requests for information have been viewed by districts as an encroachment on local control. As State accountability needs have mushroomed since Proposition 13, districts have been asked to respond to more and more data requests; and districts, recognizing the need for more coordination, have responded favorably. But, at the same time, the capacity to respond has been diminished by reductions in the overall levels of funding.

The need for data on students, college operational costs and employees is particularly acute. The absence of data and analysis gives policymakers no choice but to rely on personal perceptions and beliefs, and can thereby lead to partisan stances and solutions.

Policymaking has occurred with insufficient attention to coordination, process, and discipline about appropriate governance arenas. Since Proposition 13, there has been an increased, almost automatic, tendency to resort to the legislative arena for solving perceived problems. As community colleges have become one of the largest items in the State budget, they have become more visible. More and more members of the legislative and executive branches have naturally become interested in community college problems. Meanwhile, community college constituency groups and districts annually develop "legislative packages" and then recruit legislators to champion their causes or viewpoints. One result is that the legislative arena is inundated with community college viewpoints, each of which tends to identify problems and propose solutions from the specific perspective of the legislator, group or district. A more critical result is that the Legislature both intentionally and unintentionally has decided many educational policies that should have been decided by the Board of Governors or by districts themselves.

Community college educational issues should not be handled routinely by the Legislature in the first instance. Rather, such issues should only be dealt with in the Legislature as a last resort--in the instance that the Board of Governors and local districts have failed to satisfactorily address them.

Aside from the obvious drawback of having so many unrelated public policy changes being debated and decided at once, the current practice tends to inhibit legislators from focusing upon and being more explicit about the overall mission of community colleges. They spend a great deal of time and energy on many pieces and perspectives of community college policy, and are left with little opportunity to focus on the appropriate legislative issues: the overall role of community colleges, the relationship of community colleges to the other segments of education, and the level of funding available given other budgetary priorities.

IMPROVING THE POLICYMAKING PROCESS

Policymaking has not occurred in a focused and sequenced manner, and has often occurred with insufficient lead time. A further consequence of the lack of coordination and process regarding problems for attention is that many or most problems are being dealt with simultaneously; that multiple ways of solving the same basic problem are being considered; that it is difficult to predict what solution or combination of solutions will emerge; and, ultimately, the solutions that do emerge may not be properly interrelated and may not be adopted with sufficient lead time. The result is that local educators have not been given clear and timely signals about what it is they are to respond to, and, when the response is not forthcoming, policymakers become even more concerned because they think their will is being ignored.

The consequences of these process deficiencies go beyond what has been described above. The manner in which policy is made also plays a contributing role in the image of any institution. The image of community colleges has suffered from the confusing and uncoordinated approach to policymaking.

Process deficiencies also, to some extent, have contributed to underfunding of community colleges because legislators have at least subconsciously become confused about institutions with so many apparent interests. Finally, process deficiencies have increased uncertainty and instability within the colleges. These conditions have preoccupied educators and distracted them from their primary goal of teaching and serving students.

During 1985, the Board will carry out three activities to improve the community college policymaking process:

1. *A proposal for a comprehensive and integrated data system will be developed, with the provision of data being mandatory, and with districts being reimbursed for their costs of reporting.*

   In connection with its 1986-87 Budget proposals (which will be adopted by the Board in September of 1985) the Board will develop a proposal to pay districts for providing certain data they will be required to provide. Work on this proposal will commence early in 1985, and will allow for broad-based participation in its development.

2. *Policymakers and interested participants will be called upon to express commitment to the goals of developing a stable, positive, accountable educational environment which fosters the delivery of excellent education; and in pursuit of this goal to express a commitment to develop a manageable and sequenced set of policymaking activities to be completed or initiated in 1985.*

   The aim of all community college policymaking should be to develop a stable, positive, accountable educational environment which fosters the delivery of excellent education to students. This aim cannot be achieved unless all those who make or participate

in making community college policy commit themselves to that aim and become willing to subject their own personal, organizational, or political imperatives to its overriding importance. Achieving the aim will require focused, thoughtful effort that emerges with a manageable and sequenced set of policymaking activities to be completed or initiated in 1985. To this end, the Board will put forward the Basic Agenda as its best judgment about policymaking that needs to occur during 1985.

3. *The Board will continue to develop its annual Basic Agenda process, thereby enabling policymakers from all levels, as well as those who influence policy, to participate in the Board's discussion of community colleges issues and provide more discipline and focus to community college policymaking.*

   As the agency charged with providing leadership and direction for the continuing development of community colleges, and as the agency charged with representing community colleges before the legislative and executive branch of government, it is appropriate for the Board to set the focus for community college policymaking. It can carry out this responsibility by developing a process which encourages the participation of other policymakers and interested parties and assesses their concerns. The purposes of this process are to focus legislative and executive branch, Board and district attention on "big picture" problems facing community colleges; to place more emphasis on problem identification, documentation and analysis before recommending solutions; and, to emphasize a sense of discipline in selecting the appropriate governance arena and mechanisms for solution. The resulting product, the Basic Agenda, emerges as the Board's best judgment about the critical community college issues in need of attention during a given year.

B. SETTING THE 1985 BASIC AGENDA

In planning for 1985, it must be recognized that several major policymaking activities and critical events are already scheduled to occur during the next few years. The following are some of the concerns that should be considered when setting the agenda:

- o A review of the mission of community colleges is scheduled to occur during 1985, but it is not known whether actions to implement its findings will be proposed before the whole review of the Master Plan is completed by the Joint Legislative Committee (March 1987). If not, the earliest new legislation would be effective is January of 1988 or 1989.

- o The current finance mechanism (SB 851) is scheduled to expire on July 1, 1987. A decision needs to be made about when a new mechanism needs to be in place. Districts require lead time to plan and prepare for the new mechanism.

- o The student fee structure is scheduled to revert to prior law on January 1, 1988. The study on the impact of the fee is not scheduled for completion until July 1, 1987 -- late in the legislative session. Should the fee structure be reconsidered along with the finance mechanism, so as to require only one major adjustment by the districts?

- o Enrollments and ADA appear to be down considerably in 1984-85, for a variety of reasons. Should the current finance mechanism be adjusted, or some other relief be provided, to prevent the downward spiral effect on revenues?

These concerns and others, to be addressed by sound public policy, will require sequencing and focus. To meet this challenge, the following major conclusions and policymaking responses are offered.

1. SECURING ADEQUATE, STABLE, PREDICTABLE AND EQUITABLE FUNDING

a. Conclusions

- o Community colleges have been persistently and substantially underfunded since Proposition 13, forcing substantial reductions that have jeopardized the delivery of quality programs and services. Reductions in critical support and infrastructure areas such as student services, facility maintenance, equipment replacement and renewal, staff development and renewal, and program review and planning have been particularly serious, due partly to the fact that these areas can be reduced without losing ADA revenues. The problem of persistent and substantial underfunding is compounded for 1984-85 because the advent of tuition and other factors will signficantly reduce ADA in many districts.

- Average daily attendance (ADA) is inappropriate as a single workload measure for funding community colleges. Especially during times of fiscal stringency, this single workload measure creates unwarranted programmatic incentives and disincentives, and does not provide policymakers with adequate justification for needed revenues. Conceptually speaking, differential funding not only addresses the inappropriateness of ADA as a single workload measure and provides workload-driven funding for different areas of community college operations, but also can improve the overall equity of funding among districts.

b. Policymaking Responses

- Adequate funding for 1985-86 and 1986-87 should include full funding for the SB 851 mechanism, as well as resources to rebuild the community college infrastructure and support services -- particularly in the areas of deferred maintenance, equipment renewal and replacement, matriculation, and program review and planning. Rebuilding the community college infrastructure should not be accomplished through new permanent categorical programs, but rather by programs which can be operative during the transition to differential or other long-term funding. In addition, 1985-86 funding may require some adjustment to the ADA loss mechanism.

- Differential funding is a concept which holds promise, but which must, if approved, be implemented with care. The mechanism must be phased in, and the Board of Governors should be provided with authority to determine and adjust appropriate workload measures, as well as certify the overall level of funding.

- Issues related to student fees should be resolved, as much as possible, outside the legislative arena. Because of the controversial and preoccupying nature of student fee issues, any legislative adjustments to the student fee structure should be carefully weighed.

- Finally, enactment of the new community college funding mechanism should occur by the end of the 1986 session (September 1986), to take effect on July 1, 1987 (the sunset date of SB 851). To provide additional stability regarding funding for the new mechanism, it should, if possible, address any relevant recommendations from the mission review. Also, consideration should be given to the issue of the extension of student fees, which are due to sunset on January 1, 1988.

The Board will introduce a bill, early in 1985, to provide a two-year vehicle for accomplishing these changes.

2. MAINTAINING AND IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF PROGRAMS, SERVICES, AND EMPLOYEES

a. Conclusions

- The years of substantial underfunding since Proposition 13 have jeopardized the ability of community colleges to deliver excellent programs and services. Recent evidence about the success of transfer and vocational education students demonstrates that the quality of programs has remained high, despite the cutbacks. Still, the programs and services of community colleges can be and should be improved.

- Several important reforms to improve the quality of programs, services, and student performance have already been implemented, including the strengthened grading policies adopted in 1980, strengthened graduation requirements adopted in 1982, and the minimum standards for counseling adopted in 1983.

- Community colleges are authorized to deliver a comprehensive educational program, including transfer, vocational education, general or liberal arts, and community services. In this regard, community colleges are not simply transfer institutions. Recent data indicate that of every 12 students attending community colleges, four want to transfer, six are engaged in occupational training, and the remainder are enrolled for either basic skills or other purposes. The perception that community colleges aren't quality institutions because they don't transfer more students should be assessed in light of students' reasons for attending a community college in the first place, and the overall mission of the community colleges. On the other hand, improvements in the transfer rate, especially for minorities, as well as improved performance of community college transfer students, can and should be sought through increased intersegmental efforts.

- Community colleges have virtually eliminated purely recreational or avocational courses which are offered at state expense. Policies such as tuition, the prohibition on course repetition, and the $30 million course deletion have resulted in recreational offerings being converted to fee-based community service classes.

- More attention and energy should be given to resolving concerns about the quality of instructional and other

staff, as well as concerns about whether the existing structure of employment laws and policies promotes excellent instruction and support services. There is, in particular, a need for additional data gathering and analysis to be directed at resolving many of the concerns regarding community college employees. For instance, the concept of a "critical mass" of full-time instructors has initial appeal, but thoughtful analysis should precede the fixing of any percentage or limit. It will also be important to know the extent to which part-timers currently hold office hours, participate in curriculum development, and possess the same kinds of credentials as other instructors.

- While needing immediate attention, most of the concerns about community college employees do not appear to require immediate legislative or regulatory action. For instance, the sharp decline in the number of part-time instructors and the institution of the part-time instructor limit are factors which should allow the concept of "critical mass" to be considered more thoughtfully. Concerns about staff development and renewal need immediate attention and action, however.

b. Policymaking Responses

State and local efforts to promote excellence in community college programs and services should be increased. With respect to the Board's contribution, there are a number of specific activities which will be completed.

- For excellence in programs, the Board will continue its present work to strengthen the quality and vitality of the transfer function by coordinating with UC, CSU and CPEC on an overall plan of action; by securing funding for transfer centers; and by removing barriers to transfer that result from the lack of intersegmental cooperation in articulating courses and course standards. The Board will also continue its work to strengthen the quality and vitality of vocational education by carrying out specific strategies for the comprehensive policy, which include insuring occupational currency of staff; improving linkages with business and industry; increasing flexibility to meet students' and employer needs; updating instructional equipment; increasing involvement in short-term job training, retraining, and upgrading; and improving the quality of data on student outcomes and employer satisfaction with vocational education. Recommended policy to ensure the rigor of course offerings, as well as policy reforms to strengthen the meaning and integrity of the associate degree, will also be acted upon during the year.

- For excellence in services, the Board will seek passage and funding of the matriculation reform. This reform will improve both student performance and accountability. The Board will also develop recommendations for defining and revitalizing student services. And, finally, the Board will recommend that the Commission for Review of the Master Plan consider and propose providing student financial aid for the overall cost of community college education, not just the fee increment.

- For excellence in employees, the Board will continue its 1984 inquiry into employee quality concerns, with both short and long-term recommendations to emerge. Particular areas of focus will include the issue of critical mass, attrition in full-time faculty, the impact of tenure laws and collective bargaining, and the strengthening of credentialling standards. The Board will also develop a proposal for funding community college staff development and renewal as a part of its 1986-87 budget package. Finally, specific attention will be given to furthering affirmative action objectives during anticipated periods of extensive hiring.

With respect to local and other efforts to promote excellence, the Board intends to more actively acknowledge and encourage the many programs and activities that districts are undertaking individually.

3. DEFINING MISSION AND PRIORITIES

a. Conclusions

- Provisions of the Master Plan as expressed in statute establish an expectation for community colleges to serve all persons over 18 who can profit from instruction. These provisions also afford the colleges broad legal authority to determine the kinds of educational offerings necessary to serve their communities. Recent community college funding mechanisms, however, have served to restrict or alter the mission, often with little advance notice. The expectation to serve all students and the broad authority to determine programs have thus lost meaning and become more difficult in an era of limited funding and State intervention.

- Because the State has not grappled directly with the appropriate mission of community colleges, and instead has let the availability of State revenues dictate what will or won't be funded, the colleges have encountered major uncertainty in attempting to ascertain and respond to their mission. In this regard, the review of

the community college mission is long overdue and should help to resolve this major uncertainty.

- o While the components of the mission are relatively stable and defined, the emphasis on various program components has changed, and must change from time to time in response to demographic and societal changes, and also to reflect the special needs of the many communities the colleges serve. Priorities within the mission should not, therefore, be fixed in statute. Rather, both the Board of Governors and districts should play the major role in establishing clear priorities.

b. Policymaking Responses

The Board of Governors will continue to review and establish priorities within the mission of the community colleges. The Board especially intends to provide a strong presence in the upcoming review of the community college mission, and will complete at least four major activities in time for referral to the Commission for Review of the Master Plan.

- o First, work on futures study (trends, implications, and policy alternatives and recommended actions) will be important to help educators and policymakers address the ever-changing emphases in programs and services that community colleges must be prepared to provide.

- o Second, the Board will complete its work on the purposes and structure of remediation in the community colleges. This work, to emerge through the Board's Task Force on Academic Quality, affects not only the community college mission but also the roles of the other segments within the Master Plan.

- o Third, policies to ensure access will be developed so that full opportunities for postsecondary education are maintained during these times of uncertainty and change.

- o Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Board will explore the various methods of setting priorities within the mission, and will also assess the impact that would occur if priorities were established using these methods. This work is essential given the fact that emphases within the mission must be able to change over time. It will be essential to maintaining the Board's position that priorities within the mission should not be fixed within statute; but rather, that the Board of Governors and districts play an active role in establishing clear priorities.

4. MAINTAINING ACCESS DURING TIMES OF UNCERTAINTY AND CHANGE

a. Conclusions

- As total enrollments have declined by about 325,000 over the past three years, it becomes critical to discern who is not coming, why they are choosing not to attend, and what other educational options are available if community colleges are not. Policymakers must be careful not to conclude that all students who drop out or choose not to attend are thereby casual.

- It will not be possible to be precise, in early 1985, about which factors are most responsible for enrollment losses. Among other factors, tuition, strengthened grading policies, an improved economy with lower unemployment, and the decline in the numbers of high school graduates will all play a part.

b. Policymaking Responses

- If fall 1984 enrollments show a considerable drop in access for underrepresented groups, the Board will develop recommendations which can be implemented to counteract this drop. Other policy recommendations for maintaining and improving access will also be developed and forwarded to the Commission for Review of the Master Plan, which is charged with developing recommendations on this subject by the end of the year.

5. CLARIFYING AND IMPROVING GOVERNANCE

a. Conclusions

- Educational policymaking for community colleges in the legislative arena has been pervasive, multi-directional, and undisciplined, especially since Proposition 13. One major effect of these rapidly changing and unpredictable laws and policies has been to create major uncertainty and instability in the colleges. Without a doubt, these factors have jeopardized the delivery of quality programs and services.

- The Basic Agenda can play an important part in bringing about more stability, focus and discipline in legislative arena policymaking. The process allows for all those who make or participate in making community college policy to share their concerns. The process also focuses on documenting and interrelating the various concerns, as well as what has been done to address them. Finally, with respect to solutions, the process calls for greater discipline in selecting the appropriate arena.

- There is appropriate cause for concern about the abrogation of local decisionmaking powers; however, to characterize the problem as simply state versus local control begs the issue. The State has a legitimate interest in the overall welfare and effective functioning of community colleges; just as districts have the primary interest in having control and flexibility over day-to-day operation of the colleges. The question is how best can legitimate State policy interests be carried out while protecting the interests of local districts. Increasingly since Proposition 13, the Legislature has dictated many educational policies which should more properly be decided by the Board of Governors or local districts. The long-term public interest requires that the Board assume major responsibility for statewide community college educational policy, and that, in so doing, it will also be responsible to preserve and protect local control and initiative.

- Since Proposition 13, increased competition for students and resources has occurred -- within districts (such as collective bargaining disputes); among districts (such as interdistrict attendance disputes); among statewide interest groups (such as disputes over the 50% law or the part-time instructor limit); and among segments of education (such as disputes over admission and transfer policies). The three governance arenas need to insure fair processes for resolving conflicts arising from that competition. The autonomy of each of the arenas of decisionmaking should be respected in the decisions it it required to make, and these decisions should not be circumvented or overruled on the basis of anecdotal evidence or hypothetical concerns.

b. Policymaking Responses

- The joint governance project initiated in 1984 is a critical effort to delineate lines of responsibility between the Board of Governors and local boards, and to promote greater sensitivity in respecting those lines. The project will not have an immediate impact on delineation of responsibilities for the legislative arena, but should reduce Board intervention into local responsibilities. The project will be completed during 1985, with necessary accompanying statutory and regulatory changes to follow.

- As part of the review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the Board will call upon the Commission to look at the body of law pertaining to community colleges. The fact that such detailed and particular

statutes are in the Education Code in the first place (carried over from K-12 origins) has enormous implications, in that all changes to such statutes must be brought back to the legislative arena.

- o The Board will call upon policymakers and interested participants alike to express commitment to the goal of developing a stable, positive, accountable educational environment which fosters the delivery of excellent education; and in pursuit of this goal to also express a commitment to develop a manageable and sequenced set of policymaking activities to be completed or initiated in 1985.

- o The Board will encourage improvement and strengthening of all three governance arenas, with each arena considering ways to improve its own decisionmaking processes, and with representatives from all arenas working together to establish a clearer delineation of responsibilities.

6. IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STATE AGENCY OPERATIONS

a. Conclusions

- o The Chancellor's Office is an agency with severely limited resources attempting to respond to extensive mandatory responsibilities and somewhat contradictory expectations of state and local officials. It has already undertaken several reforms to improve both leadership and accountability.

- o The legitimacy and necessity for both leadership and accountability, the two overall functions of the Board of Governors, must be recognized by state officials and local educators alike. Leadership or advocacy for the colleges will not be credible unless the Board can also demonstrate accountability for the actions of districts. On the other hand, chaotic overregulation and great uncertainty will result if the agency simply responds to the accountability concerns and expectations of others. Accountability and leadership are both necessary, and State and local officials need to recognize and support both functions.

b. Policymaking Responses

- o A management study of the Chancellor's Office by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. will be completed by spring of 1985 and appropriate recommendations will be implemented as soon as feasible.

- The Board will continue to press for adequate agency resources, as proposed in its 1985-86 Budget, to meet its assigned and emerging responsibilities. Critical proposals include: improving agency responsiveness and adaptability, office automation, improving communication, Basic Agenda assistance, implementing comprehensive planning, and Phase II of the Information System.

- A new Community College Relations Committee of the Board of Governors will be formed so that additional attention and focus can be given to strengthening relationships and communicating with districts, other educational providers, and the general public.

- During 1985, additional internal reforms to improve accountability and leadership will be pursued, specifically: the development of a proposal to coordinate and consolidate compliance mechanisms, and a proposal for a comprehensive and integrated data system to support policymaking and planning.

NOTES

1. See Education Code Sections 8530-8538, 78200, 78300, and 78401, which further address the educational programs authorized for community colleges. See also the discussion of community college mission in California Senate Office of Research, The Neglected Branch: California Community Colleges (January 1984), pp. 9-11.

2. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Director's Report (October-November 1983), "Testimony to the Assembly Special Committee on the California Community Colleges," p. 5.

3. Data is for 1981-82 academic year and is taken from the course classification file of the Information System, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges.

4. See Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda for October 28-29, 1982; January 27-28; and December 8-9, 1983; items titled "Statement of Mission and Priorities." For a discussion of change and uncertainty regarding community college mission nationally, see George B. Vaughan, ed., Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), pp. 9-17.

5. California State Assembly, Minority Report to the Special Committee on Community Colleges (January 1984) pp. 1-5; Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda, January 26-27, 1984, "Progress Report on the Task Force on Academic Quality, "draft item on "Standards for Identifying Credit Courses Which Are and Are Not Applicable to the Associate Degree."

6. Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda, January 26-27, 1984, "Progress Report on the Task Force on Academic Quality," draft item on "Remediation in the California Community Colleges: A Proposal for State Policies"; California Postsecondary Education Commission, Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities, Commission Report 83-2 (January 1983).

7. David Savage, "Community Colleges: To What End?" Los Angeles Times, September 10, 1984; Assembly, Minority Report, pp. 2-3.

8. California Assembly Office of Research, Training Tomorrow's Workers: A Critical Evaluation of California's Employment Preparation Programs and Proposals for Change (April 1983); California Advisory Council on Vocational Education, A Call for Action! Comprehensive State Policy for Vocational Education, 14th annual report (1984).

9. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Student Charges, Student Financial Aid, and Access to Postsecondary Education, Commission Report 82-15 (April 1982), pp. 20-25.

10. Training Tomorrow's Workers, pp. 82, 86-87. A Call for Action, pp. 13-14.

11. Training Tomorrow's Workers, pp. 77-79.

12. Robert H. McCabe, "Now Is the Time to Reform the American Community College," Community and Junior College Journal (May 1981), pp. 6-10. See also Vaughan, Issues, p. 11.

13. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Redefining the Associate Degree, report prepared by Leslie Koltai et al. (1983); Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda, March 11-12, 1982, item on "Proposed Revision of the General Education Requirements for the Associate Degree."

14. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Community College Transfers, (October 1984), pp. 31-33.

15. The composition of the Commission is set by SB 1570 at: four members appointed by the Governor, three members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, three members appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, one member appointed by the Regents of the University of California, one member appointed by the Trustees of the California State University, one member appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, one member appointed by the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, one member appointed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and one member appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

16. California Association of Community Colleges, "Highlights: Community College Educational Study of Registered Voters," report prepared by Peter Hirsch (August 1983); Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, A Survey of California Public Attitudes Toward the California Community Colleges (October 1979).

17. Much of the critical commentary stemmed from University of California, Report of the Task Group on Retention and Transfer, prepared by Gerald Kissler, et al. (June 1980). The most recent comprehensive study is Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, Transfer Education, Analytical Studies Unit (October 1984).

18. University of California, A Profile of Community College Transfer Students at the University of California, prepared by Frank Baratta et al. (September 1984).

19. Assembly, Minority Report, pp. 1-2.

20. Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda, April 18-19, 1984, item on "Improving the Community College Transfer Function"; ibid., October 25-26, 1984, item on "Information on Transfer Education."

21. Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda, March 8-9, 1984, item on "Vocational Education/Employment Training Comprehensive Position Statement."

22. Jack McCurdy, "California Community Colleges Attached: Too Much Growth, in the Wrong Direction," Chronicle of Higher Education, November 4, 1981; Anne Roark, "Bloom Lost for 2-Year Colleges?" Los Angeles Times, May 2, 1982; California Postsecondary Education Commission, Student Charges.

23. Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda, July 12-13, 1984, item on "Reinstatement of Courses Deleted in August 1982."

24. California State Controller, Annual Report of Financial Transactions Concerning School Districts and Community College Districts of California, Fiscal Year 1982-83. This report shows on p. III that the "cost of education" for a high school student was $2,794, compared to $2,495 for a full-time community college student.

25. Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda, October 28-29, 1983, and September 13-14, 1984, items on "Comprehensive Planning."

26. Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Agenda, March 8-9, 1984, and October 25-26, 1984, items on "Planning and Future-Study."

27. A summary of the Associate degree's difficulties is found in an unpublished paper by Richard Yeo, executive dean of Chabot College, "The Associate Degree and University Transfer: A Draft for Discussion Prepared for the Chancellor's Task Force on Academic Quality" (September 27, 1984). Also see American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Redefining the Associate Degree.

28. July 1984; published as a supplement to American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Letter, No. 104 (August 7, 1984).

29. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 2 + 2 Tech/Prep Associate Degree: A Working Degree for America, concept paper by Dale Parnell (September 1984).

30. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Director's Report (March 1984), "California Higher Education, 1973-1983: A Ten-Year Retrospective on Thirty Trends in California's Colleges and Universities," p. 5.

31. California State Assembly, Report of the Special Committee on Community Colleges (January 1984), preface.

32. Donald E. Barshis and Thomas R. Gushey, "Providing Remedial Education," in Vaughan, Issues, p. 78.

33. Dorothy M. Knoell, "Serving Today's Diverse Students," in Vaughan, Issues, p. 21.

34. Promises to Keep, pp. 103-105.

35. Report of the Special Committee, pp. 3-3 to 3-5.

36. Ibid., pp. 4-3 to 4-6; also See Board of Governors Agenda, October 27-28, 1983, item on "Financial Aid Administration."

37. Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Report (October 25-26, 1984), "Student Profile, "pp. 1-9.

38. Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Student Matriculation: A Plan for Implementation in the California Community Colleges, report to the Legislature (April 1984).

39. In the 1979 telephone survey of public attitudes towards community colleges, the most frequent reason for attendance was "personal improvement or enrichment." The Statewide Longitudinal Study of 1978-81 categorized the reasons for attendance of those who enrolled for the first time in fall 1978 as 37% transfer, 36% vocational, and 27% special interest (including basic skills).

40. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Impact of 1982-83 Budget Constraints on the California Community Colleges: Results of a Commission Survey, Commission Report 83-28 (June 1983).

41. Paul. Al Elsner and W. Clark Arnes, "Redirecting Student Services," in Vaughan, Issues, p. 139.

42. Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, A Plan for Implementing a Differential Cost Funding System for the California Community Colleges, report to the Legislature (December 1984).

43. Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Report (October 25-26, 1984), "Board Financial Aid: A Preliminary Report," p. 10.

44. The Neglected Branch, p. 66.

45. Report of the Special Committee, pp. 2, 3-4.

46. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Director's Report (July 1983).

47. Based on a comparison of expenditure and attendance figures in State Controller's Annual Report (1982-83) with "Income and Expenditures of Public 2-Year Colleges, 1982-83," Chronicle of Higher Education, September 19, 1984, p.12. Data in the Chronicle article are taken from a survey conducted by the National Association of College and University Business Officers. Student financial aid is excluded from the calculation.

48. Discussions of community college underfunding abound. Several of the most pertinent sources are:

- On overall educational quality - California Postsecondary Education Commission, Impact of 1982-83 Budget Constraints (op. cit.), Policy Alternatives for Financing Community Colleges in 1983-84, staff report (August 1983), Special Report to the Commission on State Support of California Community Colleges (April 1984); Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Statement to the People of California and their Elected State Officials (March 1983)

- On faculty and course cuts - Board of Governors Agenda, December 8-9, 1983, item on "Consequences of 1983-84 Budget Cuts for California Community Colleges, "ibid., January 26-27, 1984, item on "Update on Impact of Budget Cuts".

- On equipment and facilities - California Association of Community Colleges, 1982 Statewide Vocational Education Study, report prepared by Lois Callahan et al. (December 1982); Board of Governors Agenda, April 22-23, 1982, item on "Deferred Maintenance and Special Repairs," ibid., December 8-9, 1983 and December 6-7, 1984, items on "Major Capital Outlay Program".

49. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Impact of 1982-83 Budget Constraints, p.16.

50. Education Code Section 71023.

51. See Chancellor's Office California Community College, Mandated Functions of the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office, Legal Office (August 1982), for a complete analysis of the responsibilities of the Board and Chancellor.

52. Examples of the Board's duties relating to leadership are to encourage regional interdistrict programs, to provide research and information services, to communicate with other segments of education, and to represent community colleges before the Legislature. Examples of the Board's regulatory and compliance responsibilities are to set standards for district organization and reorganization; to adopt standards on graduation, probation, dismissal, and employment; to exercise "general supervision" over community colleges; and to review and approve new programs and courses.

53. See Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Final Summary of Legislation Affecting Community Colleges, 1983-84 Session, Legislation and Communications Unit (October 1984).

54. The 1984 legislative session produced about 200 bills that directly or indirectly related to community colleges. Some, such as the tuition and fee compromise (AB 1XX) were very controversial and politically charged. Many were vetoed by the Governor. Most bills which became law were relatively narrow in scope and technical in nature.

55. See Gerald Hayward, "Shaping Public Policy for Community Colleges," Community College News 1, No. 5 (July 1984), p. 4.

56. Board of Governors Agenda, September 13-14, 1984, item on "Proposed Budget for the California Community Colleges for 1985-86."

57. Vaughan, p. 14 (Introduction).

58. Board of Governors Agenda, May 31 - June 1, 1984, item on "Employment Law Study."

59. California Postsecondary Education Commission, Agenda, June 10-11, 1984, item on "Annual Report on Faculty Salaries," pp. 36-38.

60. Chancellor's Office California Community Colleges, Report on Faculty Employment, Analytical Studies Unit (January 1982).

61. Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Final Report of the State Task Force on Availability Data (October 1983).

62. The Neglected Branch, p. 55.

63. Chester Case (Los Medanos College), "Community College Staff," unpublished background paper for symposium on "planning and future - study," October 1984. Symposium held in Burlingame, California under auspices of Analytical Studies Unit, Chancellor's Office California Community College.

64. Arthur M. Cohen, "Leading the Education Program, " in Vaughan, Issues, p. 176.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

STATEWIDE MISSION

The Board of Governors reaffirms the role of the California community colleges as open door institutions in keeping with the tradition of the colleges and in keeping with the provisions of the California Master Plan for Higher Education. This statement on the mission for community colleges is designed to assist the Board in carrying out its role as described in Education Code Section 71023:

> "It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall provide leadership and direction in the continuing development of community colleges as an integral and effective element in the structure of public higher education in the state. The work of the board shall at all times be directed to maintaining and continuing to the maximum degree permissible, local autonomy and control in the administration of the community colleges."

Also underlying this statement is the intent of the Master Plan for Higher Education that public community colleges offer instruction in programs that may include but shall not be limited to:

> "standard collegiate courses for transfer to other institutions; vocational and technical fields leading to employment; general or liberal arts courses; and community services"

and be authorized to grant the associate degree.

The Board recognizes that the strength and vitality of the California community colleges derives from the fact that, within a framework of state planning and leadership, local boards of trustees have the responsibility to administer colleges in accordance with local as well as statewide needs.

The Board recognizes as a primary responsibility the setting of statewide priorities and ensuring that these priorities are incorporated in the plans of local districts with district responses to them evaluated by the Board of Governors. In this way, the statewide mission statement can be used for evaluation and planning and to assist the Board in carrying out its responsibilities for leadership and direction.

ACCESS

Admission to California community colleges is open to adults, high school graduates and others as identified by law who can profit from community college instruction. The community colleges have a unique, historical responsibility to provide open admission without regard to race, ethnic or national origin, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation, or prior educational status or any other unreasonable basis for discrimination. In carrying out their responsibility for access, colleges should promote academic standards and student achievement by appropriate assessment, placement, instruction and follow-up activities, as well as program evaluation.

FUNCTIONS

Transfer Education

Community college districts will provide transfer programs which are carefully and continuously articulated with other collegiate institutions and the high schools.

Associate Degrees

Community College districts will provide associate degrees in vocational-technical programs and liberal arts programs.

Certificate Programs

Community college districts will provide certificate programs leading to early employment, and for continuing re-entry education.

General Education

Community college districts will provide courses designed to contribute to associate degree programs and/or designed to broaden knowledge, skills and attitudes, to develop analytical ability and critical thinking and to foster interest in life-long learning in the educational, scientific and cultural fields essential for effective participation in a complex society.

Student Services

Community college districts will provide student services to meet identified needs of student development. Representative activities are:

assistance in matters of admissions, financial aid, and job placement;

diagnostic testing, evaluation and monitoring of student progress;

academic, career, and personal counseling as related to the student's education;

articulation with other collegiate institutions and with high schools;

student activities.

Remediation and Basic Skills Education

Community college districts should provide remedial and basic skills education for students needing preparation for community college level courses and programs. Representative activities are:

remedial courses for students with educational deficiencies;

developmental courses and/or programs for students with special learning problems;

ongoing diagnostic/prescription programs providing for individual student skills needs.

Continuing and Community Education

Community College districts should provide non-credit classes which respond effectively to the following state and local needs pursuant to Education Code Section 84711 and in accordance with local delineation of function agreements:

parenting, including parent cooperative preschools, classes in child growth and development and parent-child relationships, and classes in parenting;

elementary and secondary basic skills and other courses and classes such as remedial academic courses or classes in reading, mathematics, and language arts;

English as a second language;

citizenship for immigrants;

education programs for substantially handicapped persons;

short-term vocational programs with high employment potential;

education programs for older adults;

education programs in home economics;

health and safety education.

This section should not be construed to apply to or interfere with any ongoing credit programs offered in the areas listed above.

Joint Programs

Community college districts are encouraged to participate in joint programs with business, industry, labor and government.

Community Services

Community college districts may respond to unique local needs by providing locally supported:

avocational courses;
recreational courses;
community and cultural events;
community and civic center functions.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
NOV 8 1985

79673-214 1/85 1,800 OSP